National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r.86/06)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A SURVEY EXAMINATION OF AN ELEMENTARY RESOURCE PROGRAM IN ALBERTA

by

© MARY THOMSON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

SPECIAL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-32353-1

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Mary Thomson

TITLE OF THESIS A Survey Examination Of An Elementary Resource Program in Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED Fall 1986

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publications rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) .....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

8304 - 181 Street

Edmonton, Alberta

T5T 0R3

DATED October 14, 1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance a thesis entitled A Survey Examination of an Elementary Resource Program in Alberta submitted by Mary Thomson in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Supervisor

Date Oct 3/86

ABSTRACT

Resource Room programs are reported to be the most widely used educational service delivery options for the mildly handicapped student (Friend and McNutt, 1984, p. 150). This study examined the self-reports of administrators, classroom and resource teachers, resource and nonresource students and parents concerning knowledge base, satisfaction and perceived effectiveness pertaining to the Resource Room program as it is currently operating at the elementary level throughout St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6. Adult and student forms of questionnaires were used to sample populations from District Office as well as from the eight elementary schools throughout the District. No differences were found between administrators, classroom and resource teachers on any of the subtests. No differences were found in the knowledge base of the purpose and function of a resource setting between resource and nonresource students. Differences were found on the satisfaction subtest which suggested a negative attitude among the older nonresource students toward the resource program. Differences were found on the academic self-concept subtest which suggested a positive attitude among the younger nonresource students. Results of parents questionnaires revealed higher expectations of the Resource Room program but parents appear limited in their knowledge roles and objectives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who have contributed to this thesis.

To Mr. Lawrence Beaudry, Superintendent, St. Albert Protestant Separate School District No. 6., for his suggestion that this project be undertaken and for his direction and encouragement along the way.

To my thesis adviser, Dr. Fern Snart, who in spite of a hectic schedule, gave so generously of her time. Her truly limitless patience and support are deeply appreciated.

To Mary Anne Bibby and Drs. Juliebo and Goldberg for their valuable input and encouragement as well as for taking the time from their busy schedules to serve as my committee members.

To the students and staff throughout the District, without whose cooperation this project could not have taken place.

To my family, for their quiet patience and support throughout this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION....1

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH....6

Introduction and Chapter Overview....6

Definitions....7

An Historical Perspective of special Education....8

Ancient Times to the Mid-Eighteenth Century....8

Eighteenth to end of Nineteenth Century....9

Twentieth to Mid-Twentieth Century....9

Mid-Twentieth Century to Present Day....11

The Categorical Resource Room....15

A Categorical Resource Room for the Educable Mentally Retarded....16

A Categorical Resource Room for the Emotionally Disturbed....18

A Categorical Resource Room for the Learning Disabled.21

The NonCategorical Resource Room....26

Accountability....43

Summary....45

Research Questions....47

Administrator, Classroom Teacher, Resource Teacher Questionnaires....47

Research Question 1....47

Research Question 2....47

Research Question 3....47

CHAPTER PAGE

Research Question 4.....48
Student Questionnaires.....48
Research Question 5.....48
Research Question 6.....48
Research Question 7.....48
Parent Questionnaires.....49

III. METHODOLOGY.....50
Setting.....50
Populations Sampled.....50
Development of Questionnaire.....51
Administrative Procedures.....54
Collection of Data.....55
Assumptions.....57
Limitations.....57
Analysis of Data.....58

IV. RESULTS.....60

V. DISCUSSION.....71
Administrator, Classroom Teacher, Resource Room Teacher Survey.....71
Perception of Roles.....71
Knowledge Base of Daily Functioning of Resource Room..74
Perception of Effectiveness.....76

CHAPTER PAGE

Perception of Satisfaction.....79
Student Surveys.....80
Perception of Function of a Resource Room.....80
Perception of Satisfaction.....82
Perception of Academic Self-Concept.....85
Summary of the Study.....91
Recommendations.....96
Concluding Statement.....99
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....101
APPENDIX A Resource Room Survey and Letter of Permission...107
APPENDIX B Administrators, Classroom and Resource Room Teachers Questionnaires.....110
APPENDIX C Student and Parent Questionnaires.....123
APPENDIX D Administrators, Classroom and Resource Room Teachers Survey Results.....134
APPENDIX E Student Survey Results.....141
APPENDIX F Parent Survey Results.....147

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Populations Sampled	56
2	Means of Selected Subtests for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Teachers	61
3	Means of Selected Subtests for Students	63
4	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Satisfaction Subscale Means for Division Two Nonresource and Primary Resource and Nonresource Students	65
5	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Academic Self-Concept Means for Primary Nonresource Students and (1) Primary Resource Students (2) Division Two Resource Students and (3) Division Two Nonresource Students	67
6	Parent Survey Results	69

I Introduction

Gickling, Murphy and Mallory (1979) and Brenton (1974) have described the rapid movement toward mainstreaming which took place in the United States during the 1970's. Mainstreaming has called for involvement of exceptional children within regular classroom programs due to the enactment of laws at the state and federal levels which have accentuated the degree of commitment toward maintaining this movement. (Gickling, Murphy and Mallory, 1979, p. 442). Along with the "mainstreaming" of exceptional children, expanded special education services have attempted to supplement regular education programs (Sindelar and Deno, 1978, p. 17). Dugoff, Ives and Shotel (1985) have addressed the rapid emergence of the special education Resource Room as a means of providing complementary instruction to the mild to moderately handicapped student, with whom this study is concerned.

The Resource Room, whether it is "categorical", "noncategorical" or an "itinerant service" (Gickling, Murphy and Mallory, 1979, p. 446) is the most common vehicle for providing remediation to the handicapped student (Dugoff, Ives, and Shotel, 1985; Friend and McNutt, 1984; Larsen, 1976; Marsh, Price and Smith, 1983). However, the rapid emergence of special education services generally, and Resource Rooms specifically has resulted in a paucity of empirical evidence "to indicate that it is substantially superior to alternative methods for all handicapped children" including the mild to moderately learning disabled child (Larsen, 1976, p. 504). Descriptions of resource models abound in the literature (Chaffin, 1974; Deno, 1973;

Fox, Egner, Paolucci, Perelman, and McKenzie, 1973; Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972; Lilly, 1971; Reger, 1973; Wiederholt, 1974). However, Sindelar and Deno (1978), and Dugoff, Ives and Shotel (1985) have alluded to the lack of empirical evidence concerning the specific conditions that influence the effectiveness of a resource program. Sindelar and Deno (1978) have cautioned that neither the "efficacy of resource programs nor the functions of program components have been adequately verified" (Dugoff, Ives and Shotel, 1985, p. 75). Although Larsen (1976) has recognized the Resource Room as a "major form of intervention for years to come" when applied "judiciously" with mild to moderately learning disabled children, further research is needed to investigate its efficacy, as well as the functions of the components which make up the resource program (p. 43).

The present study involves an examination of a prototype Resource Room program in the form of a "consumer-satisfaction survey", and discussions include the controversy which surrounds the effectiveness of a resource program. The data is in the form of self reports from (1) administrators, classroom and resource teachers, (2) resource and nonresource students (grades two and three/Division two) and (3) parents. The initial group of adults was questioned as to their knowledge base of the roles and objectives of the Resource Room program as it is currently operating at the elementary level throughout St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6. The knowledge base as to the roles of selected individuals who are directly involved with the operations of the Resource Room was assessed. Further, the knowledge base of this adult group was probed as to two major objectives of the

resource room program. The knowledge base of administrators, classroom and resource teachers was further examined as to selected criteria which govern the initial establishment of the resource program - the procedure to be followed for student selection, as well as the responsibilities of classroom and resource teachers and the students themselves. Perception of this adult group as to the effectiveness of the current resource program, its positive impact upon the students as well as on-going communication between those individuals directly involved was investigated. Two questions dealing with adult satisfaction with the program assessed any observed growth in the resource students in basic reading skills as well as a general sense of well-being among these students.

Reported differences between resource and nonresource students regarding the purpose for attending the Resource Room and the actual workings of that setting were investigated. The student's perception as to the reasons for his/her Resource Room attendance as well as individual expectations for improvement in daily school work were assessed. Questionnaire items addressed classroom and resource teacher input towards individualized planning for resource students.

Reported differences in perception of satisfaction with the Resource Room setting between resource and nonresource students were examined. Specific items addressed the enjoyment issue of attending such a program. Student motivation as well as the working atmosphere of the resource setting were also addressed.

Reported differences between resource and nonresource students in the area of academic self-concept were investigated requiring a

comparison of that self-concept with regular and Resource Room classroom peers. The older resource students were invited to respond to five additional questions which attempted to assess self-confidence and motivation as a result of attending the resource program as well as the student's general feeling of well-being within that setting. With regard to academic self-concept, the acquisition of new academic skills and study habits as a result of Resource Room attendance were assessed.

Parent perception of objectives and responsibilities were assessed by addressing the area of reading remediation and a specific responsibility carried out by the resource teacher. Parent perception as to selected criteria governing the operation of the Resource Room within this district as well as student responsibility within the resource setting were assessed. An assessment of parent expectations of (1) classroom and resource teachers' responsibilities and (2) the progress of their children during Resource Room attendance was carried out. Parent satisfaction with the effectiveness of the current resource program was probed through questionnaire items which invited personal observations of their children as to progress made within the resource program and the general emotional well-being of the children. Parents were asked to report on their perception of the child's academic self-concept as compared with that of his/her classmates in the regular classroom setting.

Chapter I has presented a backgound to the problem examined in the study, a statement of the purpose of the study, and study overview. Chapter II is a review of the literature and research

related to the resource concept. Research questions conclude the chapter. Chapter III includes descriptions of the populations sampled, the research instruments and the collection of data. Assumptions made in conducting the study, a number of limitations of the study, and a description of the analysis of the data conclude Chapter III. Chapter IV presents the results of the data. Chapter V is a discussion of the data and presentation of several recommendations derived from the study.

II Review of Related Literature and Research

Introduction and Chapter Overview

The concept of Resource Rooms is not new. Resource programs have been in existence at least since the early part of the twentieth century (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972). However, much of the literature reveals a continuing controversy as to the overall effectiveness of the Resource Room concept. The effectiveness of the special class has also come under scrutiny in much of the literature. These controversies, therefore, provide purpose for the examination of a "consumer satisfaction" type survey on a prototype Resource Room. This study investigated (1) the knowledge base of administrators, classroom teachers, resource teachers, parents and students concerning the Resource Room program and (2) the perceived effectiveness of the Resource Room program by each of these populations as it is currently operating at the elementary school level throughout St. Albert Public Separate School District Number 6 (P.S.S.D. No. 6).

Initially within this chapter, a definition of the Resource Room, a comparative definition of the special class and an historical perspective of special education as it relates to the Resource Room are presented. The treatment of the exceptional individual is briefly considered beginning from ancient times to present day. A review of the literature examines the evolvement of both the categorical and noncategorical Resource Room from the special self-contained classroom

as the only treatment setting available to handicapped children. An attempt is made to deal with the controversy which surrounds each of these Resource Room models. Literature concerning the accountability of Resource Room programs is reviewed briefly and the chapter concludes with a summary and presentation of the research questions.

Definitions

Since the Resource Room and special class are basic to most of the discussion which follows, and have the potential to be easily confused, it is essential that they be specifically defined.

The definition of a Resource Room which appears most relevant within the present study is a generic one presented by Hammill (1972). He defined the Resource Room as "any instructional setting to which children come for specified periods of time on a regularly scheduled basis for special training or services" (p. 349).

The special class has traditionally been the most frequently used placement option for the more severely disabled learner. The class and its students are assigned a label. The educable mentally retarded child goes to a class for the educable mentally retarded; the child with a learning disability to a class for the learning disabled, etc. As opposed to the previous option whereby children would remain in a regular class most of the time, "these children are isolated, in self-contained classes, from other children in the school except at recess, lunch, after-school activities, and other total school functions" (Hewett with Forness, 1977, p.83).

An Historical Perspective of Special Education

Ancient Times to the Mid-Eighteenth Century

Hewett with Forness (1977), Gearheart (1980) and Telford and Sawrey (1981) provided evidence of awareness of exceptional human behavior and development from the beginning of recorded history. The gifted were first among exceptional individuals to have been provided special educational opportunities. However, as Gearheart pointed out, educational assistance for the blind, deaf, mentally retarded and mentally ill was not provided until the mid-1700's. Because the handicapped looked and acted differently from others, because they were considered an economic burden to society, because the Church persisted in its belief in demons, witches,and evil spirits and because the nature of the handicaps were not understood, such assistance was not forthcoming.

Hewett (1977) noted four major historical determinants of the evolution of treatment of the handicapped in ancient times, (1) the need for survival or survival of the fittest, (2) the force of superstition and demonology, (3) the findings of science leaning toward a more rational, humanistic point of view regarding the handicapped, and (4) the desire to be of service to the handicapped. In attempts to deal with the handicapped, Hewett noted a continuing pendulum swing between survival and superstition, science and service during the entire time period from the beginnings of recorded history until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Telford and Sawrey (1981) also addressed the slow process of substitution of naturalistic for supernatural explanations of the

unusual in human behavior and development in ancient times. They suggested that this process is not complete even today.

In summary, educational opportunities for the handicapped from the beginning of recorded history until the mid-1700's were sporadic and short lived at best (Gearheart, 1980, p. 5).

Eighteenth to end of Nineteenth Century

Hewett with Forness (1977) described the eighteenth century as a critical transitional period for the handicapped. Fear, superstition and hostility toward those who were different began to give way to rational understanding, humanitarian care, and education. The climate was set for the true emergence of special education in the nineteenth century. Prior to the middle of the eighteenth century, widely scattered, short-lived efforts to educate the deaf and blind had been attempted (Gearheart, 1980, p. 6). In the last half of the eighteenth century, however, formal initiation of educational facilities for these handicapped individuals took place in France, Germany, and England. Early in the nineteenth century, similar facilities were established for the mentally retarded. A belief in the ability of the blind, deaf and mentally retarded to profit from education or training prompted the establishment of similar facilities throughout Europe and the United States. Gearheart (1980) and Hewett (1977) both viewed the nineteenth century as the dawning of a new age of concern for the handicapped and as the beginning of special education.

Twentieth to Mid-twentieth Century

Prior to the turn of the twentieth century, the special class for the retarded child or adult was a residential facility separate from

the public school (Schulz and Turnbull, 1984, p. 57). It was Dr. Alexander Graham Bell who, in 1898, expressed concern about the separation of these children from their age peers - precisely the same concern expressed later in the present study with regard to the categorical and, to some degree, the noncategorical Resource Room (Gearheart, 1980, p. 9). Dr. Bell recommended that programs for handicapped children should become:

> an annex to the public school system, receiving special instruction from special teachers, who shall be able to give instruction to little children who are either deaf, blind, or mentally deficient, without sending them away from their homes or from the ordinary companions with whom they are associated (Gearheart, 1980, p. 9).

As a result of this recommendation and with the support of a few school systems who had already tried out this revolutionary idea, self-contained classes for handicapped children, housed in the public schools became an accepted part of the educational scene across the United States in the years that followed.

It is of importance to this study to note that in the early 1900's, Binet and Simon developed a scientifically reliable means for evaluating intelligence that had a significant effect on diagnosis, classification, and educational planning. The use of this test revealed thousands of mildly retarded persons who had previously been overlooked. It is this mildly handicapped group with which this study is primarily concerned.

It must be noted that the Great Depression and World War II delayed progress in all fields of special education. However, by the late 1940's, parental pressure, enthusiasm of professionals and the opportunity for federal, state, and private funding renewed interest

in special education. A gradual but steadily increasing delivery of services to handicapped individuals occurred (Hewett with Forness, 1977). Gearheart (1980) discussed several general trends which took place in the United States from about 1920 to 1960: self-contained classrooms for the educable mentally retarded and physically disabled increased in popularity, state residential schools for those mentally retarded who were not served in the local public school classes flourished, state residential schools for the visually and hearing impaired increased in popularity and finally, speech therapy was provided by "itinerant specialists" (p. 10). Although there were variations in range and quality of service across states, special educational provisions for the handicapped appeared to be firmly in place as the period from 1900 to the mid-1960's came to a close.

Mid-twentieth Century to Present Day

The 1950's began a significant era in the U.S. when a series of federal legislature provisions established grants for research and training of personnel in education of the handicapped. In 1961, J. F. Kennedy committed the country's resources to the cause of handicapped individuals, in particular, to the mentally retarded.

Not only were handicapped individuals receiving attention at government levels, but during the late 1960's and early 1970's, the efficacy of special self-contained classes for the mentally retarded was the focus of attention at educational levels as well (Schulz and Turnbull, 1984). The authors discussed research studies which were conducted to assess the academic progress and social adjustment of handicapped students placed in special classes contrasted with

handicapped students who remained in regular classes.

Although these efficacy studies have been criticized because most of them were conducted on mentally retarded students rather than a broad sampling of children with a broad range of handicaps, the results were of interest. Results showed that the academic achievement of retarded students in special classes was very similar to that of retarded students in regular classrooms. Some studies indicated slightly higher gains in reading for those students attending the regular class program. Findings on social adjustment revealed that retarded students generally had low social status whether they were placed in regular or special classes (Schulz and Turnbull, 1984, p. 56). The above findings with regard to academic achievement and social adjustment of handicapped students placed in special classes is of considerable significance to this study. At this same time, during the mid-1970's, parental and court actions placed pressure on the public school systems to curtail the separation of handicapped and nonhandicapped students - again, an issue of great concern throughout this study.

Because the efficacy studies were interpreted as failing to reveal any specific beneficial outcomes for retarded children in special class placements, a movement toward mainstreaming took place. Telford and Sawrey (1981) outlined a series of events which resulted in the concept of mainstreaming:

1. the failure of research studies to establish the effectiveness of special classes for the handicapped.
2. a realization of the inadequacy of medically and psychologically defined diagnostic categories for educational purposes.
3. studies indicating that many educationally and

aptitude-irrelevant factors, such as race, social class, personality characteristics, and manageability, were operative in special class placement.

4. a realization of the deleterious effects of officially categorizing and labeling, a traditional prerequisite for providing needed educational assistance.
5. court judgments and legislation...(p. 142)

Telford and Sawrey (1981) described the concept of mainstreaming in a manner well-suited to this study. These authors viewed mainstreaming as the provision of services "on a noncategorical basis and retaining the [handicapped] child in the regular classroom with supplementary instructional assistance and support provided by specialized personnel" (p. 141).

Schulz and Turnbull (1984) defined mainstreaming as "the creation of new and different alternatives for handicapped students rather than the elimination of alternatives" (p. 49). The authors provided a list of some of these alternatives:

1. regular class with no supplementary services,
2. regular class with direct or indirect services,
3. resource room,
4. self-contained special class,
5. special school,
6. hospital-borne instruction, and
7. residential school. (p. 50).

This study is concerned with the third alternative listed above.

At approximately the same time as the special class was being questioned and the concept of mainstreaming was developing, from the mid-1960's to the mid-1970's, unprecedented change in attention to the educational rights and needs of the handicapped in the U.S. was taking place. Public Law 94-142 (P.L. 94-142), passed in the House and Senate and signed by President Ford in 1975 stipulated that "all handicapped children must have access to a free - and appropriate -

public education, with special education and related services available as needed" (Hewett with Forness, 1977, p. 568). This law provided for a written individualized educational program for each child. Moreover, it stipulated that the least restrictive environment be used when placing a child in a special program. Children were to be placed in the regular classroom whenever possible, avoiding segregation in a special class.

Even a few years prior to the passing of P.L. 94-142, Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) discussed the renewed interest in Resource Rooms taking place in the U.S. in terms of a continuum of services accommodating the mildly handicapped child with whom this study is concerned. Hawisher and Calhoun (1978) also acknowledged the mainstreaming movement in the U.S. and its incorporation of the Resource Room model as the "dominant delivery system for educational service for the handicapped student." (p. 17).

Information regarding mainstreaming and the early beginning of Resource Room programs in Canada specifically, is difficult to obtain. There is no federal body or standardized format for the collection of data on special programs (Gilchrist James, personal communication, April 26, 1986). Education is a provincial responsibility. Data collection is further complicated by the jurisdictional rights of individual school boards in each province (Gilchrist James, 1986). However, as Gearheart (1980) comments, the rather generous grant system which is funded at the provincial level in Alberta is a major factor in the provision of full educational services. These grants specifically provide for teachers of Resource

Rooms in the province, a need which is clearly recognized and accommodated (Gearheart, 1980, p. 99).

The section which follows will further serve to demonstrate the transition which occurred in many parts of the United States during the 1970's and early 1980's from the special self-contained classroom for the mentally handicapped to the Resource Room setting which is the primary focus of this study.

The Categorical Resource Room

The terms "categorical", "noncategorical" and "special class" will be used throughout this section. So as to avoid confusion, the reader is reminded of the comparative definition of a special class provided earlier in this study and is provided with the following definition of categorical and noncategorical Resource Rooms.

Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown (1978) have provided a definition of a categorical Resource Room which is best suited to the present study. Within this arrangement, the students have been officially diagnosed as mildly to moderately handicapped in specific areas including the "mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, sensory impaired, speech disordered, and physically handicapped" (p. 6). They are assigned to regular classes and receive supplemental help from a resource teacher who is specially trained in a particular disability area of special education. The noncategorical Resource Room on the other hand, is designed to meet the educational needs of children with mild to moderate learning and/or behavior problems (Weiderholt, Hammill and Brown, 1978). However, these students are not labelled by category. Programs are designed for them

on the basis of instructional, emotional and behavioral needs and even the gifted student can be accommodated (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972; Hammill and Bartel, 1978). It has been the experience of this writer that many students who require assistance in a noncategorical resource setting are mildly to moderately handicapped due to an intellectual developmental delay, and as a result, fall behind in the daily work of the regular classroom.

By the late 70's, some districts in the United States had replaced all of their special classes with categorically based Resource Rooms such as those mentioned above. Other districts had chosen to maintain the self-contained special class (Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, 1978). For clarification, and for purposes of later discussion, a brief description of specific exemplars of the categorical Resource Room designed to meet the needs of three types of handicapped children will be examined - classrooms for the educable mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed and the learning disabled. The first exemplar demonstrates some of the policies and procedures involved in implementing a categorical Resource Room for particular types of handicapped children. Since this study is concerned with the effectiveness of a resource program, the remaining exemplars describe what appear to be two relatively successful categorical situations. (The controversy surrounding the issue of categorical versus noncategorical placement will be addressed later.)

A Categorical Resource Room for the Educable Mentally Retarded

Barksdale and Atkinson (1971) described a Resource Room designed to serve pupils labelled "educable mentally retarded". In 1967, the

administration of the Atlanta, Georgia school system approved a proposal for a Resource Room which would serve a long waiting list of elementary school children who had been so labelled.

A pilot project was initiated in two elementary schools in Atlanta - one school located in the inner city, the other in a middle class neighbourhood. Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) outlined the objectives of the Atlanta Resource Room plan:

1. The learning problems of these educable mentally retarded children were to be reduced through an instructional program in concentrated sessions of individual and small group settings.
2. The students were to remain in a regular classroom with their chronological agemates and be scheduled to the categorical Resource Room for clinical teaching. Such a plan would avoid disruption of social groups, the possible stigma attached to special class placement, and hopefully result in the return of some students to the regular classroom on a full-time basis.
3. Both special education and regular classroom teachers were to be involved in cooperative planning using diagnostic tools, teaching methods and materials, and continuous assessment procedures.
4. The special education teacher would deal with the learning problems of from 24 to 32 students . The students were typically in four groups assigned according to chronological age. The special education teacher spent an average of one hour and fifteen minutes working with each group daily.
5. The school principal was to be continuously involved to act as mediator between faculty and community.

6. A continuous in-service program was to be provided for regular classroom teachers and other school personnel.

7. The overall achievement of the students was used to evaluate the usefulness of a cooperative Resource Room approach. The progress of the children and the effectiveness of the project were constantly evaluated over the three year period using a system of assessment, instruction, and measurement (Barksdale and Atkinson, 1971). Where progress was evident, the teacher moved on to other instructional levels. When progress was lacking, the teacher modified procedures to help bring about the desired change either academically or behaviorally. Through this system of continuous program assessment, the teacher gradually developed a sequential, organized program which met the needs of the student and his specific learning deficit.

A Categorical Resource Room for the Emotionally Disturbed

Glavin, Quay and Werry (1971) and Glavin (1971), described the categorical Resource Rooms which they set up for emotionally disturbed children in Philadelphia.

Three elementary schools participated in this Resource Room project. Teachers were asked to complete the Behavior Problems Checklist (Quay and Peterson, 1967) for any child felt to be either overly disruptive or overly withdrawn. Information was also gathered on the child's most disruptive times of the day, his/her classroom activity and achievement at those times, and his/her reinforcement preferences.

Between 40 and 50 children from grades two through six were

referred from each school. Half of these referrals were randomly selected for part-time participation in the categorical Resource Room; the remainder continued in their regular class and comprised the comparison group.

Approximately 90% of the children were reportedly academically delayed as well as emotionally disturbed. Although no quantifiable degree of academic delay was provided within the article, all of the children had an IQ of at least 70. Two of the schools were in low socioeconomic areas. Most of the children were Afro-American, the remaining were Puerto Rican. The third school was Caucasian and was located in a more stable socioeconomic environment.

Each child was scheduled to attend the categorical Resource Room for either one or two periods daily for 45 - 60 minutes per period with from seven to 10 children attending each period for assistance in reading (vocabulary and comprehension) and mathematics (reasoning and fundamentals). Deviant and on-task behaviors as well as teacher-pupil interaction were monitored both in the regular and resource settings. Concrete suggestions and support in handling behavior crises in the regular classroom were provided by the resource teacher. The classroom teacher, in turn, provided the resource teacher with many types of information as well as any evidence of transference of progress from the categorical Resource Room to the regular classroom (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972). In each school, a specific time and day (usually morning recess) was set aside for this exchange of information. Parent interviews were also conducted at this time. Close and ongoing communication was carried out among teachers,

project directors and principals approximately once weekly.

Curriculum was usually chosen from standard texts and workbooks. The reading material was of high interest and low vocabulary. In special circumstances, it was more advantageous to compile sequential, individual worksheets than to work from a textbook.

A token system for work completed within a time limit as well as a reinforcement system for behavioral management were put into operation. Hammill and Wiederholt (1971) provided a detailed description of these two systems.

Classroom observers were trained to time sample the children's behaviors in three areas: deviant behavior, on-task behavior and teacher-pupil contact. To evaluate academic gain, different forms of the California Achievement Test were used for pre- and posttesting all children referred.

At the conclusion of the two year project, the experimental group showed greater gains in the four areas of reading and mathematics than the control group who had received no Resource Room intervention. Significant gains were made by the experimental group in reading comprehension and arithmetic fundamentals.

Behaviorally, the experimental group performed significantly better in the Resource Room setting immediately after entering that program but any subsequent improvement in behavior was minimal. Furthermore, it was observed that generalization of improved behavior of the experimental group did not occur in the regular classroom. The data suggested that such generalization must be engineered by deliberate attempts to bring it about in the regular classroom as

well. Clearly, the controversy which surrounded the effectiveness of the special classroom continued to surround that of the categorical Resource Room.

A Categorical Resource Room for the Learning Disabled

Prior to the examination of this categorical exemplar, it is of critical importance to this study to again briefly address numerous concerns expressed in the research literature as to the effectiveness of the special class, adding impetus to the evolvement of the resource concept. Bennett (1963), Pertsch (1936), Elenbogen (1957), Cassidy and Stanton (1959), Thurstone (1960) and Johnson (1962) showed support for the findings that retarded children did not function as well academically in special classes as did matched groups in regular class settings, yet the social and personal adjustment of these children appeared to improve in the special class. Zito and Bardon (1969), on the other hand, appear to contradict this latter finding when their research showed that retarded children in special classes were impaired in their social goal-setting behaviors and in their expectancies for academic growth when compared to retarded children placed in regular classes. Sabatino (1971) addressed the substantial monetary expenditure of special class operation while serving only limited numbers of children.

Sabatino (1971) undertook a study to compare the academic achievement of children with learning disabilities placed in a self-contained special class versus two Resource Rooms. The two questions under investigation were:

1. Do children with learning disabilities achieve academically at a

significantly higher level when placed in self-contained special classes for the entire day, or when placed in a regular class, and permitted to attend a categorical Resource Room for shorter periods of time?

2. Is there a difference in academic achievement of those attending a categorical Resource Room for one hour every day as opposed to one-half hour twice a week.

For the purpose of this study, "learning disabilities" described children who:

> were evidencing an academic achievement deficit in one or more subject areas while demonstrating normal verbal intelligence, with at least one developmental year of measured deficiency in the visual, auditory, or integrative perceptual areas on the tests selected.

Sabatino (1971) described in detail the pretest/posttest methodology by which 185 out of 472 students were identified as learning disabled, including the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), the Gilmore Oral Reading Test, and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). The placement options for students in the study were as follows:

1. A control group of 11 children who remained in nine regular classes. These children received no special classroom management.
2. A self-contained class to which 11 children reported daily for all of their instruction and for registration purposes.
3. Resource Room A where 27 children - five groups with a maximum of six children in each group - reported for one hour daily with the remainder of the school day in a regular classroom.

4. Resource Room B to which 48 children, grouped as in Resource Room A, reported for one-half hour twice weekly with the rest of the school day in a regular classroom setting.

The two resource teachers concentrated on behavior modification and remediation with direct attack on work recognition and reading comprehension.

In his discussion, Sabatino (1971) outlined the results of this comparative study:

1. Each of the three experimental class structures showed more gains in each of the variables assessed than did the control subjects who remained in the regular classes. Children with learning disabilities appeared to need something extra, perhaps behavior modification, prescriptive teaching, or emotional support in order to achieve to their optimal levels academically. Sabatino (1971) suggested a teaching structure somewhere between the regular classroom and the special class, such as a Resource Room although he does not specify categorical resource intervention within this article.
2. The greatest gain in word recognition was obtained by the students in Resource Room A. Daily attendance in the Resource Room appeared to provide greater carry-over than once or twice weekly as in Resource Room B.
3. Both Resource Room settings provided greater opportunity for prescriptive teaching. This may have been due to smaller group size and a more concentrated time span available with which to instruct.

4. The greatest overall gains in academic achievement and behavior modification occurred in Resource Room A. It may be hypothesized that this plan allowed for systematic prescriptive instruction in basic behavior modification and remediation of reading skills.
5. The greatest growth in reading comprehension occurred in the children in the self-contained classroom. This may have occurred because the teacher was in a position to integrate this skill into other academic areas. Indeed, this may be an argument for the support of self-contained classes for learning disabled children.
6. The children seemed pleased and relieved to get away from the regular classroom. They expressed this feeling verbally. Both Resource Rooms offered them personal support, "necessary to initiate re-entry into the learning process" (Sabatino, 1971, p. 34).

Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) and other professionals have discussed the advantages of the categorical Resource Room as the preferred placement for the child with a particular disability because of the disenchantment with the self-contained special class as the singular instructional setting for these individuals. Hammill and Wiederholt suggest, however, that the special class will continue to be the best method of handling most visually and auditorially impaired children, some speech handicapped children and some nonreaders. Because the categorical Resource Room model conforms closely to legal definitions of handicapping conditions, to funding patterns, and to teacher certification requirements in the United States, it is

especially attractive to educators, administrators, legislators, teachers and parents (Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, 1978).

On the other hand, MacMillan (1973) criticized the use of categorical labels (learning disabled, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, etc.) discussing them as a necessity for financial expediency rather than a requirement for student learning. He suggested that the effects of such labelling might shatter a child's well-being or a family's hopes. Adams (1974), Lilly (1970), and Sabatino (1972), have argued strenuously that medically derived disability labels are of no practical use in the schools. Children should be grouped according to educational needs.

Hobbs (1975) has also raised the controversy about categorical labelling and school placement:

> Children who are categorized and labelled as different may be permanently stigmatized, rejected by adults and other children, and excluded from opportunities essential for their full and healthy development. Yet categorization is necessary to open doors to opportunity, to get help for a child, to write legislation to appropriate funds, to design service programs, to evaluate outcomes, to conduct research, even to communicate about the problems of the exceptional child. (p. 3).

Hawisher and Calhoun (1978) argued, however, that the determination of exceptionality, rather than shattering the well-being of student and family, can bring relief to both parties. It has been illustrated by Philage and Kuna (1975) that the symptoms of learning disabilities have been recognized by the family prior to the acquisition of a label, therefore of prime importance is early recognition and diagnosis of learning disabilities, followed by immediate intervention and remediation.

Although it would appear that the categorical Resource Room is the preferred setting to the special class for the mentally handicapped student, it cannot be considered a panacea with which to cure all of their ills. The categorical Resource Room, too, possesses certain disadvantages as outlined: (1) disability labelling and (2) the resultant stigma, (3) the limitation of intervention to "special-education-typechildren" only (Hammill and Bartel, 1978, p. 20) rather than to all children in a school who require assistance. Such disadvantages render the noncategorical Resource Room a highly recommended variation. This model will be the focus of the following discussion.

The NonCategorical Resource Room

As noted earlier in this study, the noncategorical resource program, is designed to meet the educational needs of those students with mild to moderate learning and/or behavior problems but categorization of the handicap is not a requirement for noncategorical resource placement (Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, 1978). The noncategorical Resource Room allows the child to remain a full-time student in a regular classroom with participation in scheduled lessons in a separate classroom or Resource Room (Hewett with Forness, 1977). While the noncategorical Resource Room accommodates these students, the special class serves the more severely impaired children who cannot be integrated into the regular classroom even with the help of a Resource Room teacher (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972). Rusalem and Rusalem (1980) have described the noncategorical Resource Room as an intermediate option between the special class and the regular class,

"designed to reap their advantages and avoid their pitfalls." (p. 151).

The noncategorical Resource Room setting allows for small group instruction in reading and/or mathematics and instruction is provided by a special education teacher. Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) outline three complex responsibilities of the noncategorical resource teacher. Such a teacher must be able to (1) assess the specific educational and behavioral needs of each student referred to the Resource Room (2) individualize the instruction for each child and (3) work closely and harmoniously with the other members of staff and parents. Adelman (1972) saw Resource Room teachers performing valuable services in a variety of ways; by providing in-service teacher education, by advocating the rights and needs of problem pupils, by providing advice regarding policies affecting these pupils. Secondary functions might include the provision of supplementary assessment when appropriate, and the development of new policies and practices, help in the search for materials, and participation in research activites.

Numerous educators have expressed strong support for the noncategorical resource concept when compared with the effectiveness of either the special class or the categorical Resource room. In his examination of the Resource Room concept, Sabatino (1972) continued to argue that special classes generally were not providing consistent, increased academic achievement for the handicapped student. Although he did not specifically apply the label "noncategorical" to his description of the resource concept, that description is consistent

with and adds breadth to the definition provided earlier in this study:

> Our major task should be to remove the legal, administrative, and medical labels and structures which force us to depend upon categorical programming. In their place, we need a continuum of program alternatives which will encompass the educational problems, and therefore the instructional goals, which lead to educational and behavioral management...a total instructional accountability and a culminating effort from all the disciplines, while keeping a central purpose - education (Sabatino, 1972, p. 345).

Hammill (1972) supported Sabatino in this argument for the noncategorical Resource Room and has addressed some of the problems inherent with both the special class and the Resource Room concept which can be circumvented through use of a noncategorical model and which are of direct interest to this study:

1. Students are not labelled as handicapped since disability diagnoses are not necessary for placement.
2. Since labelling and segregation are avoided, any stigma associated with receiving special attention is minimized.
3. Students can usually receive help in their neighborhood school thus avoiding the necessity for busing.
4. Scheduling is more flexible. The Resource Room teacher can act as a support in the regular classroom or in the Resource Room as required.
5. No significant time lapse need occur between the teacher's referral and the commencement of remedial help since placement is an individual school matter.
6. Medical and psychological workups are done on a school request basis rather than for placement purposes. Therefore, the school

psychologist has more time for counselling.

7. Because the Resource Room will serve most of the handicapped students, the special classes will become instructional settings for the truly handicapped.
8. Because of the broad training and experience of the resource teacher, that individual may well become an "in-house" consultant to his school (p. 351).

Hammill (1972) warned, however, that as in the case of the categorical Resource Room, the noncategorical model is not a "panacea" which will quickly resolve the problems of every handicapped student. Successful noncategorical resource programs require "considerable public relations, tact, administrative support and...teacher competence" (p. 354). Hammill warned, too, that the noncategorical model is not a substitute for the special class.

Adelman (1972) supported the view that the special class remained a potentially useful concept for those chidren with severe learning/behavior problems. Adelman, however, supported the resource concept. Like Sabatino, he argued for an interpretation broad enough to encompass a variety of resource functions. Examples of such functions included:

> Supplementary assessment and instruction; teacher education (encompassing such facets of staff development as pre- and in-service education, supervision, consultation): advocacy of the rights and needs of problem pupils; development of or communication of new policies and practices; the finding and provision of materials; involvement in empirical investigations (research and evaluation (p. 364).

Each of the functions outlined by Adelman are of direct interest to this study.

Reger (1972), in support of the noncategorical Resource Room, viewed a noncategorical Resource Room program as serving at least three purposes. One purpose was to offer direct services to children by demonstrating to the classroom teacher how a child responded to certain techniques. Reger (1972) saw a second purpose of the noncategorical Resource Room as offering direct service to teachers. The Resource Room and classroom teachers could discuss important matters which affected specific students. A third purpose served by the noncategorical Resource Room was the opportunity for the Resource Room teacher to help all the professionals within that school setting to interact more effectively with the students. Reger (1972), therefore, felt strongly that Resource Room teachers must be highly qualified, well informed individuals. Their task within the noncategorical Resource Room was to pinpoint areas of learning need and deal with these areas whether they were in perceptual deficits, emotional deficits, reading deficits, etc.

The controversy surrounding the resource concept and the special class is expressed in the writings of numerous educators. Heller (1972), for example, challenged Sabatino's conception of the noncategorical Resource Room as a "continuum of special instructional environments" (Sabatino, 1972, p. 338). Heller, like Adelman, believed that such a continuum should not exclude "the special class and its advantages" (p. 375). Heller, too, argued that the special class would continue to be the best educational placement for some children. However, he criticized a number of basic assumptions which he felt Sabatino was making and which called for critical inspection.

The following is a summary of Sabatino's assumptions with which Heller took issue:

1. Self-contained classrooms are instructionally inferior.
2. Regular classrooms are instructionally sound.
3. Current special education teachers are poorly trained and unqualified for their teaching assignments.
4. These same poorly qualified teachers can become good resource personnel.
5. Regular classroom teachers can be trained to accept prescriptions from special education professionals.
6. Accountability may be attained, as to which system has responsibility for the child's progress - resource or regular classroom. (The matter of accountability will be discussed later in this chapter.)
7. Academic instruction ought to receive greater emphasis than social development.
8. Special educators can establish Resource Rooms and new relationships with relative ease (Heller, 1972, p. 369).

In summary, Heller recommended a continuum of program alternatives broad enough to fill the needs of every child including the special class.

Ohrtman (1972) agreed with the concept of a continuum of programs and services. However, he argued with Sabatino on the issue of etiology and the medical model. Ohrtman believed that to eliminate categories and labels would severely impede considerations in dealing with the management, therapy, and planning for the handicapped child.

Church (1980) supported this stand so long as the limitations of labelling are recognized. Ohrtman agreed with Sabatino that special classes in the United States were generally unsuccessful. Limited expectations of teachers, classes serving as dumping grounds, and poor pre-service training of teachers are a few of the factors which Ohrtman attributed to this situation. However, Ohrtman (1972) argued that intellectually handicapped children are demonstrably different from normal children and to deny these differences by the elimination of "categories, labels and all negative implications of being different" (p. 378) does not negate them. Ohrtman warned that a Resource Room will not negate these differences. He further cautioned that an overcommitment to that model could prove a disappointment.

The foregoing discussion has attempted to deal with some of the elements of the ongoing controversy as to the overall effectiveness of the special class versus the Resource Room concept which is the focus of this study. There appears to be evidence that it is viable to do an individualized examination of Resource Room programs which are ongoing. The remainder of this section will focus upon such programs.

Hammill, Iano, McGettigan and Wiederholt (1972), measured the growth in reading of educable retarded pupils placed in regular classrooms with additional noncategorical Resource Room aid. The degree of retardation was not provided. However, the authors reported an average increase of .7 of a grade in seven months of attendance. The authors warned that the results were inconclusive since forces other than Resource Room intervention may have accounted for the improvement.

Reger and Koppmann (1971), and Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) have described the implementation of the noncategorical Resource Room operated by the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (B.O.C.E.S.) in suburban Buffalo, New York. Because of the growing number of children said to have serious learning difficulties, a search for alternatives to special class programs was undertaken. This led to the establishment of a Child Evaluation Centre where children were assessed and placed in noncategorical Resource Rooms.

Several unique features existed within the latter centre. First, teachers were involved in the assessment profiles of the students, to the exclusion of psychologists, social workers and medical personnel. Second, nothing that took place during assessment was considered confidential. Any information that seemed confidential, was withheld since it would be of no use. Third, parents were encouraged to participate in the entire process of evaluating their children for educational disabilities and skills. Fourth, no child in a BOCES special program was eligible for reference to the centre. Only students in regular classrooms with whom teachers required assistance were eligible. The nature or degree of the handicap was not spelled out nor did the child have to fit any diagnostic category. One child was deemed eligible because his abilities seemed low and he needed assistance with his work. Another child was eligible because he seemed to be very bright and was bored with school and thus had become disruptive and unproductive. The nature and degree of handicap of these students appears consistent with that of the Resource Room students with whom this study is concerned.

After pinpointing problem areas, the teachers designed specific ways in which to assist the students. They provided tutoring for individuals or small groups. No child was to be in the Resource Room more than half a day each time. If any child required more than half a day, that child was placed in a special class for full instruction (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972).

Although the progress of the children was not provided, the Resource Room project appeared to be successful since, after two years of operation, the original 11 units in 1969-70 were expanded to 23 units in 1970-71. In addition, six other Boards of Cooperative Educational Services in other parts of New York state had initiated Resource Room programs in the fall of 1971 (Reger and Koppmann, 1971, p. 462).

Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) and Hammill (1972) provided brief descriptions of a noncategorical Resource Room approach implemented cooperatively in September 1970, by Temple University and Philadelphia Public schools. Six educable retarded and three emotionally disturbed classes were disbanded in three centre-city elementary schools. The students were returned to regular classes at or near their chronological age levels. Six noncategorical Resource Rooms took the place of the special classes. Initially, 104 students were being served. By January 1971, that number had swelled to 200.

By the end of the first year, nearly all of the students originally identified as "disturbed" had blended into the student population and were no longer receiving resource help. More than one third of the "retarded" children were in the regular class without

resource help (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972). The authors cautioned, however, that one reason for the successful integration of these students may have been the fact that the schools in this centre-city area were characterized by low pupil achievement in the regular classes. Of interest, however, was the accumulation of research which suggested that the retarded children appeared to learn as well or better when placed in regular classrooms with resource help than when they were enrolled in special classes.

Finch and Craig (1977) described the successful establishment, in 1973, of the Elementary Language Arts Assistance Program (E.L.A.A.P) in the Edmonton Public schools.

E.L.A.A.P. was set up to provide assistance for children in grades one through four who were of average or above average ability, but displayed a significant discrepancy between actual and potential achievement in Language Arts. Small group tutorial instruction was provided primarily in reading but also in oral and written language, spelling, listening and viewing. Classes usually consisted of four to five students who attended the Resource Room for one half hour per day, four or five days per week.

The objectives of E.L.A.A.P. were:

(a) To overcome specific deficits in the Language Arts skills before these become crippling disabilities complicated by emotional and social factors;
(b) To prevent a child's loss of self-confidence and to enhance his feelings of "success";
(c) To ensure that the skills learned in the Resource Room will be applied in the regular classroom;
(d) To approach more closely the goals of academic achievement set by parents, teachers and the students themselves;
(e) To enable Resource Room teachers and classroom teachers to learn to use "diagnostic teaching methods";
(f) To acquaint [classroom] teachers with materials which can be used

for "remedial techniques" in a classroom setting as well as in a Resource Room. (p. 2).

Evaluation of the operation of the program and its integration into the school in the first four years of existence was gathered through questionnaires sent to the Resource Room teachers at each of the sample of 60 schools, and questionnaires sent to 300 classroom teachers who had students in the program. General observation and reports by the Resource Room reading specialists, an evaluator, as well as interviews with the team sector of the Bureau of Child Study also constituted a part of the evaluation design.

In order to determine the progress of the children, questionnaires were sent to Resource Room teachers, regular classroom teachers of the children involved, and to the parents. Standardized pre- and post-testing, as well as the Piers-Harris Self Concept Test, were administered to the students. Results of the evaluation indicated that;

1. There were significant positive changes in the yearly growth rate of all students, between 1.4 and 1.7 in reading and 1.4 and 1.5 in spelling. Students in grade two had consistently shown the greatest gains over the four years of program operation. This latter finding is of direct interest to this study.
2. Both resource and classroom teachers saw the greatest student attitude and behavior changes in the areas of: confidence in ability to succeed in the classroom work and activities; feeling successful at school; general self-concept and enjoyment of reading. Less change was seen in the areas of peer relations and

classroom behavior (Larch et al., 1977). Again, resource teachers saw the most consistent changes occurring in grade 2.

3. The inservices presented for classroom and resource teachers were helpful in heightening the awareness of both groups about diagnostic teaching and testing techniques.
4. Teachers reported that communication between classroom and Resource Room teachers was useful although resource teachers felt that insufficient time had been made available for such communication.
5. Integration and acceptance of the Resource Room program by teachers and principals appeared to be very positively viewed and had been increasing over the four years of operation.

In summation, all of the respondents felt positively about the Resource Room program. Principals, classroom teachers, and parents recommended continuation of the program (Finch et al., 1977). E.L.A.A.P. was withdrawn in June, 1979, due to lack of funding. Again, lack of funding has forced Resource Room assistance to be further reduced to .2 in small schools, and .5 in larger ones in the Edmonton Public School system (Finch, April, 1986).

It is clear that even though labelling and categorization of disabilities is not required for noncategorical Resource Room placement, the separation from regular classroom agemates even for a short time during the school day, the stigma attached to being different and the uncertainty as to the purpose for Resource Room assistance are three elements of the continuing controversy surrounding the placement of exceptional children.

The social outcomes of two mainstreaming programs in a suburban Pittsburgh community were compared for 24 learning disabled children in grades one through three (Meece and Wang, 1982). The children were randomly assigned to one of two mainstreaming programs - the Adaptive Learning Environment Model (A.L.E.M.), an integrative setting which allowed students to attend the regular classroom on a full-time basis and consisted of regular, handicapped and gifted students. The second non-A.L.E.M. classroom provided basic skills education for a similar grouping of children who attended a Resource Room setting for a part of each day. The type of resource setting, categorical or noncategorical is not provided within the article. However, because the term "learning disabled" encompasses a broad range of intellectual deficits, consideration of this study as a noncategorical setting is appropriate.

The findings revealed more positive trends in the adaptive educational program in which the handicapped students were instructionally integrated into the regular classroom. Those handicapped children showed higher ratings of competence and received higher peer acceptance ratings than did the handicapped students in the traditional Resource Room program. These findings reinforce the recommendations outlined by Berres earlier in this discussion.

Although the findings are far from conclusive, it is suggested that the A.L.E.M. students may have benefitted from greater contact with non-handicapped peers. Wang and Meece (1982) point out, however, that the possible social benefits of intergroup contact depend on classroom provisions for the development of same.

Since communication between administrators, classroom teachers, Resource Room teachers, parents and the students themselves is a major concern within this study, it is of interest to consider a study undertaken by Sevcik, Bonita et al. (1983) to examine communication of Individual Educational Program (I.E.P.) Goals among parents, regular classroom teachers, Resource Room teachers and administrators.

An I.E.P. was developed to meet the educational needs of experimental subjects. A study was designed to determine the effects of Resource Room teachers' use of repeated curriculum-based measurement and evaluation procedures as an alternative to informal assessment methods. The focus of this study was to examine the extent to which these data were effectively communicated to those professionals mentioned above. Because of the limitations of the communications survey, the authors caution against the formulation of generalizations. However, the individual survey results provide interesting information.

Within one school district, the majority of classroom teachers who participated in the periodic review conference found the assessment information to be very useful even though less than half of the total numbers of teachers participated in the I.E.P. conference. Data showed that the majority of these teachers were not informed of the student's reading goal, reading program or any changes by the special education teachers. Most of the classroom teachers did not know whether the student met his/her year-long reading goal. (Sevcik, Bonita, et al., 1983). Yet in another school district, teachers indicated greater participation in and clarity of their students'

reading programs and progress in the Resource Room setting. The reasons for such between-district differences were unknown.

The parent survey showed that most of the parents attended the I.E.P. conference and were informed of their child's annual reading goal, yet only half of them could state that goal and less than half again could state the goal accurately and completely. Moreover, only half of the parents reported satisfaction with the reading goal established for their child. Ysseldyke and Thurlow (1980) observed similar findings in a previous study in which parental reaction during such conferences was investigated.

Administrators generally responded favourably to the survey carried out by Sevcik, Bonita, et al. (1983). They had participated actively in the students' I.E.P. conferences, students' goals and progress. They were generally satisfied with the information they had received. Sevcik, Bonita et al. concluded that greater emphasis needed to be placed on effective communication between parents and school personnel and, as well, among individuals in different roles within the school. Such communication among professionals is of particular interest to this study as it impacts directly upon the effectiveness of the resource program under examination.

Adams (1982) presented a study which surveyed the attitudes of 49 Elementary Education majors from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. The case study of an hypothetical student with behavior problems was described along with three special education placement possibilities - a self-contained class, a regular education classroom and a Resource Room setting. The Resource Room was not specifically

labelled "non-categorical" within the article, but it was described as a "less restrictive educational environment...where students needing special help could go without the need of removing the student into a segregated setting" (Adams, 1982, p. 343).

Over 90% of those future teachers elected the Resource Room placement over the other two possible placements. The self-contained special classroom, they believed, was too restrictive, yet they considered the student's behavioral problems to be too severe for full-time regular classroom placement. Further, they felt that the resource teachers must attempt to modify the child's behavior rather than wait for spontaneous or outside assistance from a psychotherapist (Adams, 1982, p. 346). The attitudes of these future teachers would seem to reenforce the view that a "key concept in mainstreaming is the emphasis on Resource Rooms as a major option in teaching children with behavior problems" (Adams, 1982, p. 345).

Hayes (1983), as a result of an Attitude Scale administered in the state of New Jersey, raised a concern about the effectiveness of reading compensatory programs used in that state. This study was significant in that it was concerned with teachers' viewpoints regarding "In-Class" versus "Pull-Out" reading programs for students experiencing economic and social deprivation. An in-class compensatory reading program was one which was conducted "within the confines of the regular classroom" and taught by a compensatory reading teacher; a pull-out compensatory reading program was one whereby the student left the regular classroom for instructions (Hayes, 1983, p. 9). This latter plan appears to be very similar to

the Resource Room plan with which this study is concerned.

Through the use of the same questionnaire, but in different school districts, the Hayes study attempted to replicate the results of a study by Marie Davis (1982). The results of the same questionnaires yielded totally contradictory results. The Davis study found that the teachers surveyed preferred an in-class compensatory program. The Hayes study discovered that a larger number of teachers preferred the pull-out compensatory reading program. Hayes (1983) concluded that the contradictory results of the two studies render any conclusions impossible. The author points out that further attention needs to be paid to the "characteristics of successful [reading compensatory] programs" and to the improvement of the education of the culturally deprived" (Hayes, 1983, p. 28).

In summary, just as the categorical Resource Room setting should not be viewed as a panacea with which to solve all intellectual deficits, neither should the noncategorical resource setting be so viewed. However, it would appear that such critical issues as labeling, segregation from regular classroom peers and the resultant social stigma may be minimized through the use of the noncategorical setting. As well, Hammill, Iano, McGettigan and Wiederholt, 1972), Finch and Craig (1977) and others have provided evidence that language skills can be strengthened considerably with the support of the noncategorical setting, particularly with early placement and remediation, preferably at the grade two level.

Accountability

Because this study is an examination of a "consumer satisfaction" type survey on a prototype Resource Room and its overall effectiveness, it seems appropriate to consider the matter of accountability for the success or failure of such a program. Sabatino (1972) specified "instructional accountability" as one aspect of the education of handicapped students. As mentioned earlier in this study, in 1975, in the United States, President Ford signed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act: Public Law 94-142. This bill provided for equal educational opportunity for handicapped children (Hawisher and Calhoun, 1978). Along with this commitment came increased pressure for accountability in education (Bonita, Sevcik, et al., 1984). Accountability of special education programs for handicapped children should be a major concern in Canada as well as in the U.S.

Of accountability, Vergason (1973) offered the following:

> Special education is a part of regular education and as such must be concerned with the same efficiency and effectiveness issues. Special educators must also be concerned with the attitudes and actions of its publics. Special educators can no longer assume that because it is a special education it is good for everyone. Special education cannot rely on the sympathy of legislators and others but must produce hard data on its successes and failures.

Vergason focussed especially upon resource programs, special classes and other administrative arrangements and the problems of delivery of these services to students. He believed the central question to be "who is accountable?" (p. 457). In the special class, special education has been accountable. In the resource plan, however, where students are enrolled in regular classes but served by

supportive special education personnel, the responsibility has been transferred back to mainstream education.

Vergason recommended that classroom teachers be encouraged to accept mildly handicapped children into their classrooms rather than opting for their removal. The task requires a change of attitude among classroom teachers as well as training in new skills and understanding. Stewart (1983) and Hudson, Reisberg and Wolf (1985) supported Vergason in his recommendations for a change of attitude among regular classroom teachers and for better training in dealing with the handicapped child in the regular classroom. Following this, Vergason asserted that teachers should take certain steps to assure personal accountability.

1. Early into the school year, children's strengths and weaknesses should be assessed.
2. Levels of academic and/or behavioral performance should be established for each child along with the expectation that these levels be met within a specified time.
3. Teachers should request the consultative help and materials as requested from the supervisor or superintendent.
4. Parents must be kept informed of all activities. The teacher should outline in what way the child and parent should work together to bring about those anticipated levels of performance which are already in place.

Vergason believed that if teachers are to be held accountable, so then should administrators. The latter group of professionals must provide the necessary tools and a working situation to allow teaching to be

productive:

> "Special education programs without materials, without trained teachers without educational assessment, yet with over-enrolled classes have not done the profession any service" (Vergason, 1973, p. 460).

It would seem appropriate that classroom teachers, Resource Room teachers and school administrators share the responsibility and accountability for the students receiving services in the resource setting.

Summary

The literature and research reviewed in this chapter focussed upon four areas. These included: the special class, the categorical Resource Room, the noncategorical Resource Room and the issue of accountability.

A wholistic analysis of this literature and research precipitates a number of general observations and conclusions. Specifically these are:

1. Much of the literature and research points to the Resource Room model as a more effective learning situation for learning disabled children than the special self-contained classroom. However the special self-contained classroom appears to be the preferred educational setting for the severely learning disabled as well as the sensory impaired.
2. While the research is inconclusive, it appears that the advantages of the noncategorical Resource Room outweigh those of the categorical Resource Room as a setting for academic and social development, particularly for the mildly to moderately

intellectually handicapped with whom this study is primarily concerned. Further to the categorical Resource Room, the literature would suggest that categorical labelling of handicapped children can have a deleterious effect upon self-concept. As to the social development of these children in the categorical setting, the literature is inconclusive.

3. The literature reveals a need for better, more consistent communication among all interested parties. Sevcik, Bonita et al., (1983) showed that participation in and clear communication of students' programs and progress, were lacking. Finch et al., (1977), on the other hand, revealed quite the opposite results.
4. Accountability of Resource Room progress, both in the U.S. and Canada is a major concern. Vergason (1973) offered numerous recommendations to teachers, parents and administrators which are designed to remedy the accountability questions, many of which will be addressed at the conclusion of this study.
5. Because of the inconclusiveness of the literature as to the overall effectiveness of the Resource Room concept and the ongoing controversy which surrounds that concept, there is good reason to examine a specific program such as that at the elementary level throughout St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6.

Research Questions

Administrator/Classroom Teacher/Resource Teacher Questionnaires

Research Question 1

(Part A - Questions 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11)

Are there reported differences in the knowledge base of the roles of selected individuals and of selected objectives of the Resource Room between administrators, classroom teachers and resource teachers?

Research Question 2

(Part A - Questions 1, 2, 7, 9, 10)

Are there reported differences between administrators, classroom teachers and resource teachers in their knowledge base of (1) selected criteria designed to govern the establishment of the resource program and (2) the responsibilities of selected individuals who contribute directly to the efficient daily operation of a Resource Room?

Research Question 3

(Part B - Questions 13, 14, 16, 17)

Are there reported differences in the perception of effectiveness of the current Resource Room program between administrators, classroom teachers and resource teachers?

Research Question 4

(Part B - Questions 12, 15)

Are there reported differences in the perception of satisfaction with the current Resource Room program between administrators, classroom teachers and resource teachers?

Student Questionnaires

Research Question 5

(Questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7)

Are there reported differences between Resource Room students at grades 2 and 3 and grades 4, 5 and 6 and the respective non-Resource Room students at these grade levels on selected questions regarding the purpose and function of a Resource Room setting?

Research Question 6

(Questions 1, 5, 8, 9, 12)

Are there reported differences between Resource Room students at grades 2 and 3 and grades 4, 5, and 6 and the respective nonResource Room students at these grade levels in their perception of satisfaction with the Resource Room setting?

Research Question 7

(Questions 10, 11)

(Questions 14 - 18 - Resource Room students (Grades 4, 5 and 6 only)

Are there reported differences between Resource Room students at

grades 2 and 3 and grades 4, 5 and 6 and the respective nonResource Room students at these grade levels in their perception of academic self-concept in the Resource Room setting?

Parent Questionnaires

A descriptive examination of parental responses allows an estimate of:

A. parent perceptions of responsibilities and objectives of the current Resource Room program (Part A - questions 2, 3).

B. parent perception as to the criteria governing student placement in the Resource Room setting and student responsibility within that setting (Part A - questions 1, 4).

C. parent's expectations as to teacher and student participation within the Resource Room setting (Part A - question 5; Part B - questions 6, 7).

D. parent's satisfaction with the effectiveness of the current Resource Room program (Part B - questions 8, 10).

E. parent perceptions of the child's self-concept within his/her regular classroom while participating in the Resource Room programs (Part B - question 9).

III Methodology

This chapter delineates the parameters of the study, including a description of the populations sampled, the instruments employed, data collection, limitations and assumptions of the study.

Setting

The study was conducted in eight elementary schools in the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District No. 6 (P.S.S.D. No. 6). St. Albert is situated approximately five miles northwest of the City of Edmonton, Alberta. It has a population of 35,900. The P.S.S.D. No. 6 enrolls over 5,400 students from Kindergarten to Grade twelve in eleven schools. The eight elementary schools involved in this study were:

1. Keenooshayo Elementary (K -6)
2. Robert Rundle Elementary (K-6)
3. Elmer S. Gish Elementary/Junior High (K-9)
4. Leo Nickerson Elementary (K-6)
5. Ronald Harvey Elementary (K-5)
6. Sir Alexander MacKenzie Elementary (K-6)
7. Wild Rose Elementary (K-6)
8. William D. Cuts Elementary/Junior High (4-9)

Populations Sampled

Six populations from eight schools were represented in this study, including;

1. six District Office administrators and 16 school administrators.
2. fifty-four classroom teachers, most of whom send students to the Resource Room.

3. nine Resource Room teachers (two such teachers in one school).

4. sixty-one Resource Room students in grades two and three, ranging in age from approximately seven years to nine years of age and forty-three Resource Room students in Division II, ranging in age from approximately nine years to 12 years of age.

5. eighty-one non-Resource Room students in grades two and three, ranging in age from approximately seven years to nine years of age, and one hundred twenty-eight non-Resource Room students in Division II (grades four through six) ranging in age from approximately nine years to 12 years of age. Two representative elementary schools were selected wherein the non-Resource Room students completed the appropriate questionnaire in classrooms from each of grades two through six.

6. one hundred and four parents of Resource Room students representing a total of one hundred and four Resource Room students.

Development of Questionnaire

The data utilized in this study were recorded by means of written questionnaires. The administrator/teacher questionnaire was patterned after the Assessment for the Learning Disabled questionnaire developed by the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education (1985) (see Appendix B). Part A of the questionnaire, consisting of 11 items, was designed to assess understanding of the criteria which govern the operation of the current Resource Room program. Part B, consisting of six items, assessed the administrator/teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the program.

Part A of the questionnaire included an examination of

administrator/teacher knowledge of roles carried out by selected individuals directly involved with the Resource Room program (questions 4, 5, 8 and 11), and objectives of the program pertaining to student weaknesses in the Language Arts were examined, as well (questions 3 and 6).

Questions 1, 2, and 7 probed knowledge of the criteria designed to govern the initial establishment of a Resource Room program. Knowledge of responsibilities of selected individuals who contribute directly to the efficient daily operation of the Resource Room was assessed by questions nine and 10.

Part B of the administrator/teacher questionnaire included examination of perception of the effectiveness of the Resource Room program as it impinges directly upon the students in that program (questions 13 and 14). Perception of the communication among classroom teachers, Resource Room teachers and parents of Resource Room students was investigated through questions 16 and 17.

Overall satisfaction with the language arts remedial program was assessed by question 12, and the apparent happiness of the Resource Room students from an adult-perspective was probed through question 15.

Part A of the administrator/teacher questionnaire provided for three response choices - one choice correct, one choice partially correct and a third choice incorrect. Part B of the questionnaire provided for a five choice response - strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), disagree (D), strongly disagree (SD). In addition, the respondents were invited to provide additional comments at the

conclusion of the questionnaire.

The parent questionnaire was patterned after the administrator/teacher questionnaire in that it was made up of two parts of five questions each (see Appendix B). Both parts of the questionnaire provided for a three-choice response - Yes (Y), No (N), Uncertain (U). A variety of questions attempted to ascertain parents' opinions in the areas of roles and objectives, daily functioning of the Resource Room program, expectations, effectiveness of and satisfaction with the program. Parents were invited to write comments at the conclusion of the questionnaire.

The format for the student questionnaire was patterned after the Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE) Program Student Survey-Primary and Intermediate Forms (see Appendix C for examples). Questionnaires for administration to Resource Room students at grades two and three and grades four through six (Division II) were composed of 13 and 18 questions respectively. The additional five questions on the Division two questionnaire were believed by the examiner to be too difficult for valid responses from the younger Resource Room children. Questionnaires for administration to non-Resource Room students at the same grade levels were made up of twelve questions and for comparison purposes, were the same essentially, as the Resource Room student questionnaires. Student perception of the purpose for attending a Resource Room program (questions 4, 6 and 7) and two critical functions of an effective Resource Room program were probed (questions 2 and 3). In addition, the actual and perceived levels of satisfaction with the current Resource Room program as reported by

Resource Room and non-Resource Room students respectively was assessed since student satisfaction is of critical interest to this study (questions 1, 5, 8, 9 and 12).

The student questionnaire also attempted to assess academic self-concept as perceived by Resource room and non-Resource Room students (questions 10 and 11). Academic self-concept is further investigated through question 13 and the additional five questions on the Division II questionnaire as mentioned earlier in this chapter. These questions will be dealt with descriptively in chapter V.

The students were provided with three possible response choices which were of a yes (Y), no (N), and uncertain (U) format. Again, the students were invited to comment at the conclusion of the questionnaire.

The appropriate questionnaires were pilot tested with four administrators, one classroom teacher, one Resource Room teacher, one parent and one student from each of Divisions one and two and then revised accordingly.

A covering letter explained the purpose of the study and assured the respondent of confidentiality. A copy of this letter is located in Appendix A.

Administrative Procedures

In early April, 1986, initial approval of the research project was granted by Mr. Lawrence Beaudry, Superintendent of Schools, St. Albert Protestant Separate School Board No. 6 (see Appendix A). The examiner personally contacted the principal or vice-principal of each school to explain the purpose of the proposed study. Each Resource

Room teacher was interviewed by the examiner to provide similar information.

The examiner delivered sets of questionnaires to each Resource Room teacher for administration to her students. Each student was given a questionnaire to be completed by the parent. Administrators, classroom and Resource Room teachers were also provided with the appropriate questionnaires for completion.

Collection of Data

Questionnaires were collected during April and May. Follow-up telephone calls were made to parents. The response rate of each sample population is outlined in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Population Samples	Response Possible	Response Actual	% Received
District Office Administrators	6	6	100
School Administrators	16	16	100
Classroom Teachers	54	40	74.57
Resource Teachers	9	8	88.88
Resource Room Students Gr. 2&3	*61	61	*100
Resource Room Students Gr. 4,5,&6	*43	43	*100
Non Resource Room Students Gr. 2&3	*81	81	*100
Non Resource Room Students Gr. 4,5,&6	*128	128	*100
Parents of Resource Room Students (Gr. 2-6)	104	79	75

*These numbers do not include those students who were absent at the time of survey administration.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were considered to be relevant to the present investigation:

1. That the students' placements in the Resource Room were valid placements.
2. That school administrators, classroom teachers, Resource Room teachers and parents had agreed on Resource Room students' level of functioning and areas needing remediation so that these skills might be developed in school and encouraged at home.
3. That the questionnaires provided for valid and reliable responses.
4. That the sampling procedure was adequate to provide for valid results.
5. That the students completed the questionnaire to the best of their ability.
6. That all questionnaires evoked honest, reliable responses.

Limitations

1. The major limitation of the study is inherent in the utilization of a questionnaire as the sole data collection instrument. The possibility of respondents misinterpreting the meaning of a question, or not being able to fully express their answers within the limitations of the questionnaire format, is always present. The questionnaire-type instrument, by its very nature, is a social instrument whose usefulness cannot possibly be

determined in the laboratory (Lecky, 1961). The test of validity reduces itself to a test of consistency among opinions.

2. Because of the small sample size of each population surveyed, generalizations based on the data must be viewed with caution.
3. Difficulties were encountered with the return of the parent questionnaires. Several parents did not return them even after telephone contact. For this reason, an interview method for parent data collection is recommended for future studies of this kind.

Analysis of Data

The data presented in this study are both comparative and descriptive in nature. In instances where a three-choice response was provided, a weight of 3 was given the preferred or factually correct choice; a weight of 1 to the least preferred or incorrect choice. When a five-choice response was offered, a weight of 5 was given the preferred or correct choice and a 1 was given the least preferred or incorrect choice. Numerical data were recorded and analyses of the data were carried out with the assistance of the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the Michigan Terminal System (MTS) computer programs at the University of Alberta.

One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the mean subtest totals of the administrator/teacher, and student questionnaires respectively, followed by pairwise contrasts using the Scheffe Method when significant mean differences were determined.

The parent questionnaires were summarized in terms of means and standard deviations and percentage breakdowns of response options for each question.

IV Results

Mean totals for the selected groups of questions dealing with roles and objectives, selected guidelines governing the establishment and daily operation of the Resource Room, satisfaction with and the effectiveness of that program were compared for administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Room teachers using analyses of variance in each case. In no cases did significant differences result (see Table 2 for subtest means; Appendix D for detailed breakdown of responses.)

Table 2

Means of Selected Subtests for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Teachers

Subtest	Administrators 22	Classroom Teachers - 54	Resource Room Teachers - 8
Roles/ Objectives	1.57	1.74	2.03
Establishment/ Daily Operation	2.05	2.13	2.52
Satisfaction	3.16	3.34	3.56
Effectiveness	3.22	3.08	3.56

Mean totals for the selected groups of questions dealing with the purpose and function of a Resource Room, satisfaction with the resource program, and academic self-concept were compared for Resource Room and non-Resource Room students at the grades two and three and Division two levels respectively (see Table 3 for subtest means; Appendix E for detailed breakdown of responses.)

Table 3

Means of Selected Subtests for Students.

Subtest	Primary Resource - 61	Division 2 Resource - 43	Primary Nonresource - 81	Division 2 Nonresource - 128
Purpose/ Function	2.69	2.59	2.68	2.60
Satisfaction	2.51	2.41	2.60	2.12
Academic Self-concept	1.98	2.06	2.51	2.22

Significant differences were found for satisfaction with the Resource Room program when sample means were compared through one-way analysis of variance. An F ratio of 9.38 was observed for significance at the .001 level for df, = 3/309 (see Table 4).

Table 4

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Satisfaction Subscale Means for Division 2 Nonresource and Primary Resource and Nonresource Students.

Source	MS	DF	F	P
Groups	4.48	3	9.38	*0.000
Error	0.48	309		

*p < .001

The Scheffe procedure further identified significant differences between the sample means of the Division two nonresource students and both the primary resource and primary nonresource students. Higher means were observed at the grades two and three nonresource level in both instances.

Significant differences were found for academic self-concept with the Resource Room program when sample means were compared through one-way analysis of variance. An F ratio of 7.91 was observed for significance at the .05 level for df, = 3/309 (see Table 5).

Table 5

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Academic Self-Concept Means for Primary Nonresource Students and (1) Primary Resource Students (2) Division 2 Resource Students and (3) Division 2 Nonresource students.

Source	MS	DF	F	P
Groups	3.80	3	7.91	*0.000
Error	0.48	309		

*p < .05

The Scheffe procedure further identified significant differences between the sample means of (1) primary nonresource and primary resource students, (2) primary nonresource and Division two resource students and (3) primary nonresource and Division two nonresource students. Higher means were again observed at the grades two and three nonresource level in all three instances.

Means and standard deviations were obtained for each of the subtests on the parent survey (see Table 6).

TABLE 6

Parent Survey Results

Subtest	Item Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Objectives	2	2.92	.313
Responsibilities	3	1.36	.644
Selected criteria governing student placement and student responsibility in the resource program.	1	1.78	.853
	4	1.97	.903
Expectations	5	2.99	.113
	6	2.74	.542
	7	2.91	.398
Satisfaction	10	2.67	.574
Effectiveness	8	2.77	.576
Parent perception of child's self-concept	9	2.27	.821

NOTE: Possible range of scores per item = (0 - 3)

A descriptive examination of parent responses is provided in Chapter five. Appendix F includes an overview of frequencies and percentages of each of the responses for the parent survey.

V Discussion

Administrator, Classroom Teacher, Resource Room Teacher Survey

Perception of Roles and Objectives

Analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant differences between the mean totals for perception of roles and objectives of administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Room teachers as to the current operation of the Resource Room programme at the elementary level throughout St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6. (see Table 2, Chapter 4). However, inspection of frequencies and percentages (see Appendix D) reveals that while 100% of Resource Room teachers provided the preferred response to question three dealing with the major objective of the Resource Room, only 68.2% and 77.8% of administrators and classroom teachers respectively did so. Further to the role of the reading clinician, question 11, only 4.5% of administrators provided the preferred response, while 33.3% and 37.5% of classroom and resource teachers respectively provided the preferred response. These results might be explained by the fact that administrators are more removed from the resource program while resource teachers are closest and are therefore familiar with its objectives, etc. None of the groups appeared familiar with the complex role of the Reading Clinician.

Of the six (100%) District Office administrator questionnaires returned, two (33.3%) were incomplete because of insufficient information regarding the current Resource Room program. Missing data was not included in previous means. However, two questionnaires

provided comments which expressed concern that each Resource Room situation is different and this difference must be taken into account when attempting to make summative comments regarding roles and objectives. Because one objective of the resource program is to enable the student to cope comfortably in the regular classroom, concern was expressed that this carry-over may not be happening, that too many areas are in need of remediation resulting in discouragement for both student and resource teacher, and student placement in the Resource Room is perhaps overly long.

Eight (53.3) of 15 school administrators provided comments. The argument for early placement, preferably at the grade two level, was expressed for Resource Room remedial intervention in reading so that an early return to the regular classroom reading program might be anticipated. This re-entry into the regular classroom was a concern during the early history of the categorical Resource Room. (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1971, p. 16). The study described in chapter two, undertaken by Finch (1977) reenforced this argument for early placement in that by "providing students' with assistance, in the early grades, serious disabilities with their accompanying social and emotional problems can often be forestalled" (p. 2). Further it was felt by school administrators that the entire Resource Room program, its roles and objectives, should be clearly spelled out to all of the professionals involved in that program in greater detail than is perhaps presently the case.

Seventeen (42.5%) of 40 classroom teachers supplied comments. In the area of roles and objectives, an essential need was expressed, as

in the case of administrators, for early Resource Room reading remediation, preferably at the grade two level. A carry-over of reading skills into the regular classroom was an area of concern to classroom teachers as well as to administrators.

Classroom teachers expressed the view that school principals should be more involved in the Resource Room program. Such involvement was encouraged as far back as 1972 in the establishment of the Atlantic resource plan (Barksdale and Atkinson, 1971). Vergason (1973) supported the active involvement of the school principal in all special education programs including that of the Resource Room. "If a teacher is to be held accountable, the administrator must provide the necessary tools and a working situation to allow him to be productive" (p. 460). In support of the active role of the principal in the resource program, Hammill and Wiederholt (1972) state the following, "if one individual, other than the resource teacher himself holds the key to the success of the Resource Room model, it is the school principal. His strengths, goals, and needs are critical to a smoothly operating program" (p.42). Within the context of this present study, it would seem that greater involvement of principals in the overall operation of the resource setting than is perhaps now the case, would be welcomed.

Two (25%) of eight Resource Room teachers questionnaires provided comments and these raised two issues of particular interest to this study. First, classroom teachers and resource teachers should schedule early in September so that reading periods in the Resource Room may be appropriately integrated with those in the regular

classroom. This issue will be addressed later in this chapter.

A second issue raised was that the resource teacher should be encouraged to work within the regular classroom - an arrangement which would appear to be presently in limited operation within the St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6 Resource Room setting and which warrants consideration. Classroom teachers also commented upon the desirability of such an arrangement. Indeed, the Resource Room teacher filling the roles of instruction, assessment and consultations within the regular classroom receives strong support in the literature (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972; Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, 1978; Gearheart, 1980; Schulz and Turnbull, 1984). Dugoff, Ives and Shotel (1985) have summarized four instructional roles of the resource teacher.

1. Direct small group and individual instruction with a remedial/academic emphasis in the regular classroom.
2. Team-teach in the regular classroom as an alternative to direct resource services.
3. Develop objectives for each child jointly with classroom teachers working together to implement these objectives.
4. Coordinate instructional materials used in the resource program with the materials used by the regular classroom teacher (p. 80).

Reger (1972) and Adelman (1972), as discussed in Chapter two supported these comprehensive roles as they applied to the Resource Room teacher.

Knowledge Base of Daily Functioning of Resource Room

Analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant differences between the means for the knowledge base of administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Room teachers of (1) selected criteria which govern the establishment of the resource

program and (2) the responsibilities of selected individuals who contribute directly to its efficient daily functioning (see Table 2, Chapter 4).

With regard to criteria governing the selection of students who attend the Resource Room in St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6, it is proposed that only those students of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observation receive assistance in apparent weak areas of the language arts (Resource Handbook, St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6, p. 2). Frequencies and percentages across these adult groups reveal that while 75% of resource teachers were aware of this guideline, only 31.9% of administrators and 33.3% of classroom teachers were so informed (see Appendix D). This mildly handicapped student population is consistent with those students discussed by Wiederholt (1972) who were to be accommodated by the mainstreaming movement which took place in the U.S. during the 1970's.

In the Resource Room setting with which this study is concerned, assistance is to be provided in the language arts area either individually or in small groups of no more than six students as described by Hewett with Forness (1977) in the historical overview. Again, 75% of resource teachers provided the preferred response to this item, while only 27.3% of administrators and 46.3% of classroom teachers responded in this way. Again, it may be concluded that resource teachers are more familiar than either administrators or classroom teachers with this particular guideline because of these teachers' involvement with its implementation.

Although the matter of length of each session of instruction is not a part of the criteria covered within the questionnaire, it is of direct interest to this study to address classroom teacher concerns in this area. Five (9.3%) teachers and one (4.5%) administrator expressed a need for more Resource Room time for their students. Concern was also expressed that the program is, at times, a "token" program which is underfunded, scantily manned and overused.

In the area of responsibilities of selected individuals who contribute directly to the efficient daily operation of the Resource Room and, more specifically, the critical issue of cooperation between the resource teacher and classroom teacher in scheduling Resource Room time, four (7.4%) classroom teachers reported good cooperation. On the other hand, three (5.5%) classroom teachers argued that important core subjects as well as other classroom activies were missed by students because of minimal resource time available. It would appear that greater allottment of resource time within the school system presently under study might serve to minimize this critical problem of scheduling.

Perception of Effectiveness

Analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant differences between the mean totals for perception of effectiveness of the current Resource Room program between administrators, classroom teachers and resource teachers (see Table 2, Chapter 4). Further inspection regarding perception of effectiveness reveals that while 59.2% of administrators and 50% of the resource teachers believed there to be a strengthening of self-concept in their resource

students, only 38.9% of classroom teachers agreed with this item (see Appendix D). Such results may be explained by the fact that classroom teachers have direct, daily contact with their resource students and are, therefore, in a better position to assess the area of self-concept than are administrators or resource teachers.

While 9.1% of the administrators and 27.8% of the classroom teachers strongly agreed (SA) that most resource students have shown a significant increase in their desire to read for enjoyment as a result of resource attendance, 0% of resource teachers responded in this way (see Appendix D). It may be assumed that the low percentage responses of administrators and resource teachers is due to their lessened daily exposure to the students and the lack of opportunity to note such an observation.

Further to the perception of the three adult groups in the area of effectiveness, the two items tapping communication among those individuals directly involved received similar response rates with classroom teachers' responses (SA) the highest of the three groups followed by administrators and resource teachers (see Appendix D). Both the literature review and comments supplied by the adult groups addressed the critical issue of communication between administrators, classroom and resource teachers, parents and the students themselves. One (1.5%) administrator stressed the importance of regular communication between Resource Room teachers and administrators. Identification of, and reasons for student placement in the program, continuous progress reports, other concerns or observations (emotional, social) and test results were specific areas cited for

regular communication. Three (5.5%) classroom teachers reported good communication with the resource teacher and with the parents of resource students. However, one (1.8%) classroom teacher recognized a need for clarity and honesty when informing parents that although the student may be doing well in the Resource Room, the carry-over may not yet be evident in the regular classroom.

Two studies discussed in the historical overview address the importance of open communication between classroom and resource teacher (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972; Glavin, Quay and Werry (1971). Dugoff (1985) makes the following statement regarding classroom/resource teacher communication:

> The role of the elementary special education Resource Room teacher depends substantially upon his or her relationship with the regular classroom teacher in whose classroom the handicapped student spends most of the school day. Communication and understanding between the people most directly involved in the instructional process, namely resource and regular teachers, would clearly appear vital to the success of the handicapped student (p. 76).

In addition, several suggestions were offered by classroom teachers to encourage greater effectiveness of the current Resource Room program:

(1) More individualization than would appear to be currently carried out within the current resource program such as that supported by P.L. 94-142 passed in the U.S. in 1975, as well as I.E.P.s alluded to within a study undertaken by Bonita et al (1983),

(2) the use of newer, more challenging ideas and teaching materials,

(3) greater flexibility within the Resource Room program to meet more individual needs of students,

(4) less use of stickers and food as a means to strengthening self-concept, an important issue addressed as part of the study undertaken by Finch (1977), and

(5) more accountability among resource teachers.

Further consideration of each of these five suggestions as they apply to the Resource Room program within this study are desirable.

Perception of Satisfaction

Analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant differences between the means for perception of satisfaction with the current Resource Room program between administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Room teachers, suggesting a fairly consistent level of satisfaction with the current resource program across the three groups. However, inspection of frequencies and percentages would suggest that while 40.9% of the administrators and 62.5% of the resource teachers agreed (A) that their students appeared to be making significant gains in reading in the regular classroom, only 25.9% of classroom teachers agreed with this item (see Appendix D). Again, such results point to the close association of classroom teachers with their students on a daily basis as they observe the transfer of reading skills or lack of these skills into other academic areas.

For the purposes of this study and because of the overlap between peceived effectiveness and perceived satisfaction, the two variables will be combined throughout the following discussion.

Regarding the overall satisfaction with the effectiveness of the current program in St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6, one (6.3%) school

administrator supported Resource Rooms as a valuable additional service in the reading program where both students and teachers benefit from the added attention and assistance given the students. Sabatino (1971) noted similar benefits gained when learning disabled children were given this added support. In addition, administrators saw the program as important from a parental standpoint, in that the child receives special assistance. It is fair to assume that as taxpayers and consumers, this is an issue of considerable importance to parents. Four (7.4%) classroom teachers expressed strong support for a full-time resource program which would allow for easier student scheduling, a problem discussed earlier in this chapter as well as providing assistance to a greater number of students. In the majority of schools within this study, Resource Room assistance is available on a part-time basis only.

Further to the overall effectiveness of the resource program, three classroom teachers expressed dissatisfaction as to its effectiveness in dealing with reading remediation, even suggesting that fewer students per classroom would allow the classroom teacher to remediate more effectively within the classroom setting. Smaller class sizes would allow the classroom teacher (1) more time to remediate those students requiring reading assistance and (2) allow for more purposeful application of weaknesses into other subject areas.

Student Surveys

Perception of Purpose and Function of a Resource Room

Analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant

differences between the mean totals for perception of the purpose and function of a Resource Room setting between Resource Room students at grades two and three and grades four, five and six (Division two) and the respective non-Resource Room students at these grade levels (see Table 3, Chapter 4). Further, resource and nonresource students responded fairly consistently percentage-wise on all items of this subtest with the exception of item two (see Appendix E). Seventy eight point seven percent of primary resource students agreed that the resource teacher should make a plan for each student, while only 41.9% of the older resource students agreed with this item.

Comments were included on 28 of the 61 (46%) test protocols for primary resource students, as compared with 24 out of 43 (56%) for Division two resource students. Similarly, comments were provided on 16 of the 81 (19%) test protocols for primary nonresource students as compared with 24 out of 128 (19%) for Division two nonresource students.

Although no comments were addressed to the general area of the function of a Resource Room, and specifically to individualized student programs and communication between classroom and resource teachers, inspection of the comparative means has suggested an accurate perception of these two selected functions within the Resource Room setting.

Regarding perceptions of the purpose for attending the Resource Room and expectations as a result of their attendance, three (3.7%) primary students felt that they were "learning" because of their resource placement.

One (1.2%) primary student commented that he would rather go to resource than to his regular classroom. Such a report may be comparable to one result of a study undertaken by Sabatino (1971) which revealed that the students seemed relieved to leave the regular classroom for a time for the personal support which the Resource Room offered.

One primary student expressed anxiety about regular classroom work which was missed while attending the Resource Room, again raising the issue of cooperation between classroom and resource teachers as to careful scheduling discussed earlier in this chapter.

Further to student perception as to the purpose for attending the Resource Room, one (2.3%) Division two student expressed "a hope to learn stuff and pass his grades". A second Division two student commented that the Resource Room was probably "good for people who need help in reading and spelling".

Perception of Satisfaction

Analysis of variance and Scheffé post-hoc tests revealed statistically significant differences between the mean totals for perception of satisfaction with the current Resource Room setting between the Division two nonresource students and both the primary resource and primary nonresource students (see Table 4, Chapter 4). Examination of the means would suggest that the Division two nonresource students view the concept of attending a resource Room significantly more negatively than either of the two younger groups. This finding was reenforced when percentages of responses were examined. With the exception of item 5, responses provided by the

primary resource and nonresource students revealed consistently higher frequencies and percentages than did the older nonresource students on the remaining four subtest items (see Appendix E).

A review of the literature provides a rationale for the more positive attitudes of the younger students in its frequent discussions favoring early placement of students in the Resource Room setting. Finch (1977) noted that Resource Room teachers observed the significantly consistent improvement in attitudes in terms of general satisifaction both socially and academically at the grade two level. The least significant changes occurred at the grade four level. It may be assumed that feelings of satisfaction would become even less among students at the higher grade levels as they become more aware of being separated from age peers. Berres (1982) in a study involving exceptional children in grades four through nine found the matter of alienation to be a serious one. Dr. Alexander Graham Bell addressed this problem as early as 1898. One major purpose for the establishment of the noncategorical Resource room was to minimize the effects of alienation.

Further to the perception of satisfaction as to the current resource program at the elementary level in St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6., eight (9.9%) primary resource students commented that attendance in the Resource Room was enjoyable. These students cited the use of games and books as ways by which learning was made challenging and exciting. Five (6.2%) primary resource students reported that they liked their resource teachers. Only one (1.2%) primary resource student expressed the negative opinion that resource was "fun

sometimes".

Four (4.9%) primary nonresource students commented that they would like to attend the resource program in their schools. One student reported past attendance in that program and "loved it". On the negative side of the satisfaction issue, four primary nonresource students reported that they were glad not to be in the program; going to resource would "not be fun" and they would not go. These students reported that they would seek help from their classroom teacher. In this way, it may be assumed that the problem of alienation from regular classroom peers would be eliminated, an issue of direct importance to this study.

Four (9.3%) resource students from Division two expressed satisfaction with their Resource Room teachers and classmates. One (1.3%) student from this group believed the Resource Room program was a good opportunity to obtain extra help in reading and spelling. Four Division two resource students felt that access to computers should be a part of the resource program. Four students expressed the need for a larger Resource Room. Further to perception of satisfaction two (1.6%) nonresource students from Division two commented that the resource program seemed like a good one for students who needed help. Two students from this sample believed that they could personally benefit from the Resource Room program. However, six (4.7%) Division two nonresource students commented that they would not want to go to the Resource Room for help.

It is of importance to this study to discuss two issues which were raised frequently throughout the literature and which have been

strongly reenforced by comments supplied by seven (5.5%) of the older nonresource students and which are directly related to one another - labelling and taunting.

The issues of labelling of exceptional children who attend special programs and the taunting which often ensues have long been concerns to educators and are discussed frequently in the literature (Teleford and Sawrey, 1984; Hobbs, 1975; Ohrtmann, 1972; Adams, 1974; Sabatino, 1972. Berres (1982) directly addressed the matter of taunting among 44 Resource Room students (chapter 2, p. 29). His findings are reenforced by the comments of Division two nonresource students surveyed in this study; "people in resource get teased and always get into trouble", "people call you dumb", "bunch of dumb kids". One nonresource student at the grade six level wrote the following comments:

> I think going to a Resource Room sometimes is hard on students because other children may make fun of them. If I were behind in school work I wouldn't mind going but if it were only possible for the teacher to ask the class to put themselves in the shoes of the person in the Resource Room and how they would feel about being made fun of.

Perception of Academic Self-Concept

Analysis of variance revealed statistically significant differences between the means for perception of academic self-concept both in the regular classroom and in the Resource Room setting between three pairs of students, (1) the primary nonresource and primary Resource Room students, (2) the primary nonresource and Division two resource students and (3) the primary nonresource students and Division two nonresource students (see Table 5, Chapter 4). Based upon

the two items which probed the academic self-concept subtest, the results reveal a consistency over the three comparisons with the primary nonresource students viewing themselves as more adept academically than the comparison groups. This result is consistent with the percentage of response of these students on subtest item ten (see Appendix E). On the other hand, subtest item eleven which also probed academic self-concept resulted in a higher percentage of positive responses (61.7%) from division two nonresource students. Further to the concern with academic self-concept, it is of importance to this study to note that the resource students at both the primary and Division two levels view themselves as considerably less adept academically as compared with their nonresource classroom peers. Numerous writers have addressed this matter of academic self-concept as it impacts upon the learning disabled with whom this study is concerned.

Examination of five items to which the older resource students responded reveal lower positive response rates (60.5%) to item 17 but higher positive responses (83.1%) to item 15 suggesting good motivational purposes for resource attendance (see Appendix E).

Written comments were supplied by nonresource students at both primary and Divsion two levels regarding academic self-concept as it pertained to the Resource Room setting; "I'm proud I don't have to go and I'll probably never have to go", "I like being in a normal class", "I'm smart already", "it [going to resource] would be embarrassing", "I've been to resource three years in a row, I don't want to go anymore because I don't feel very smart in school", "I used to be in

resource and I got alot smarter".

Self-concept generally, and academic self-concept specifically, of the learning disabled has been a major concern as evidenced through the writings of numerous educators. The reader is reminded of Ohrtman's (1972) argument that the intellectually handicapped student is different from his nonhandicapped peers. "Stigma has been attached to almost all conditions of humanity that are significant deviations from the normal, an effect which has led to expulsion from existing society" Gearheart, 1980, p. 4). It may be speculated that stigma has a direct impact upon academic self-concept as the student attempts to interpret events within his immediate environment (Berres 1982, p. 2). Based upon both these writings and the statistical results of the academic self-concept subtest, it is important to recognize the apparent breakdown in this critical area among older students, both resource and nonresource students. This recognition is reenforced by the Finch (1977) study where the greatest improvement in general self-concept was noted at the grade two level. The noncategorical resource model is designed to minimize this problem of categorization lending to stigma, and negative academic self-concept. Clearly, the problem remains as one aspect of the controversy surrounding the Resource Room concept.

Parent Surveys

Employing a 3-point scale wherein 3 = Yes, two = Uncertain, and 1 = No, parents generally did not score well in the areas of knowledge of responsibilities (see Table 6; Appendix F). Parents' tendency was to score higher in the area of expectations (combined $\bar{x}$ = 2.88)

Thirty-eight (48.1%) of 79 parent questionnaires included written comments, and these addressed six areas of particular concern to this study. A descriptive examination of these comments as well as consideration of percentages of responses as they apply to each of the six subtest follows.

Ninety two point four percent of parents agreed with item two of this subtest (see Appendix F). In addition seven (8.9%) responses were directed specifically at parent perception of the objectives of the current resource program. It was asserted that parents should be partners in the education process, yet six (7.6%) parents reported that they were not informed of the goals of the Resource Room placement as these goals related to their children. The parents were, in fact, informed of their child's Resource Room placement after that placement had already occurred. Reger and Koppmann (1971), Hammill and Weiderholt (1972), Finch (1977) and others have emphasized the importance of total parental involvement in the referral and program planning process, as well as in the placement of their children in Resource Rooms.

Regarding parent perception as to selected criteria governing the selection of students for Resource Room placement, only 26.6% of the parents agreed (see Appendix D). Four (5.1%) parents commented that students who were below average in general ability should be given access to the extra assistance in resource; that assistance be expanded to include Mathematics and that Resource Room programs be developed at the high school level. Only thirty-eight percent of the parents agreed with item four. Six parents regarded the resource

program not as a privilege but a "must" and a "necessity". The opinion was expressed that it is incumbent upon each school to provide help in a Resource Room setting when required.

As previously mentioned, parents scored higher means on the three items which probed expectations. These higher scores were reenforced in terms of frequencies and percentages as well (see Appendix F). In addition, fifteen (18.9%) responses addressed the matter of expectations as to teacher and student participation within the resource setting. Two (2.5%) parents reported good communication with the Resource Room teacher. Nine (16.6%) responses expressed the need for more communication among all of the professionals involved in the resource setting. Six responses (11.1%) specifically recognized the need for better communication between resource teacher and parent regarding ways in which the resource program might be reenforced at home. Parents expressed a need for feedback from the Resource Room teacher as to the progress of their children, either in a weekly or monthly report and not just at report card time.

Hewett with Forness (1977), Reger (1972), Sevcik, Bonita et al (1983), Vergason (1973) throughout the literature review have recognized the extreme importance of open communication between administrators, classroom and resource teachers, parents of resource students and the students themselves.

As to parent perception of student participation, the hope was expressed by parents that their children be given continued Resource Room assistance. Concerns were raised about work which was missed in the regular classroom. The need was expressed for the classroom

teacher and student to communicate regularly in this regard.

This survey did not attempt to match parent and student. However, it is of direct interest to this study to compare parent and student responses as to the perception of satisfaction with the student's progress in the resource setting. Examination of the raw data revealed that 70.8% of the parents of all resource students reported satisfaction with their child's progress (see Appendix F). Seventy-eight percent of the primary students and 58% of Division two students reported parent satisfaction with their progress in the resource setting. In addition, eighty-four point four percent of the parents agreed that their child enjoyed his/her time in the Resource Room. Further to the above, four parents commented that they had found the resource teachers to be "caring" people who had helped to keep their children motivated.

Since parental concern was expressed that resource teachers be specially trained to carry out their duties, this is an area for periodic assessment throughout the St. Alberta P.S.S.D. No. 6 if such reassessment is not presently carried out. The review of the literature supported the importance of Resource Room teacher training Reger (1972), Adelman (1972), Vergason (1973) and Finch (1977).

Further to the effectiveness of the program, seven (22.9%) parents reported that the oral reading and language skills of their children had improved as a result of Resource Room placement. It was suggested that the children themselves be consulted as to their perception of personal growth in the language arts. Both the Finch (1977) and Berres (1982) studies addressed this area of personal

growth and in both studies the students reported positive growth in the language arts area as a result of their Resource Room placement.

Five parents commented that for greater development of their child's language arts skills, daily attendance in the Resource Room is needed. One forty-five minute period in a six-day cycle is insufficient for consistent growth in reading. The review of the literature underlined the importance of this daily attendance in the writings of Glavin, Quay and Werry (1971), Sabatino (1971), Hammill, Iano, McGettigan and Wiederholt (1972).

Regarding academic self-concept, only 49.4% of parents agreed with item 9 (see Appendix F) while 25.3% were undecided, reenforcing the need across the district for awareness in that area. Perceptions of the child's self-concept within his/her regular classroom while participating in the Resource Room program were positively reflected in four (5.1%) of the parent comments. These parents reported that in addition to the child's enjoyment in attending the resource program, that self-confidence had improved and that the students felt good about themselves within the regular classroom as well.

Regarding academic self-concept, only 49.4% of parents agreed with item 9 (see Appendix F) which invited a response as to their perception of their child's academic self-concept as compared with regular classroom peers. It is important to note that 25.3% of the parents were undecided as to this item reenforcing the need across the district for awareness in this area of academic self-concept.

Summary of the Study

The special education Resource Room has rapidly emerged as a

means of providing complementary instruction for the mildly to moderately handicapped student (Dugoff, Ives, and Shotel, 1985). In the U.S., statutory and court-imposed deadlines have dramatically increased the number of Resource Room programs, so that there has been little time available for systematic analysis of its many functions. This study conducted a survey of administrators, classroom and Resource Room teachers as to their knowledge base of the roles and objectives of the resource program, as well as their perception of the effectiveness of the program which is currently operating at the elementary school level in St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6.

Resource Room and non-Resource Room students were also surveyed to investigate their knowledge base of the purpose and function of a Resource Room program as well as their perception of satisfaction and academic self-concept both in the regular classroom and in the Resource Room.

In summary, although there were no statistically significant differences in the mean totals for perception of roles and objectives, as well as selected criteria and responsibilities which contribute to the daily functioning of the Resource Room between administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Room teachers, these areas pertain to the current operation of the resource program at the elementary level throughout St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6, a breakdown of percentages of individual responses revealed differences in each of these areas.

No statistically significant differences were found in the perception of the effectiveness of and satisfaction with the resource program. Again, however, inspection of frequencies and percentages of

individual subtest items revealed differences between these adult groups.

No differences were found between primary and Division two Resource room and non-Resource Room students in their perception of the purpose and function of a Resource Room setting. With the exception of one item probing this subtest, inspection of individual responses supported this consistency across the groups of students.

Differences were found in the perception of satisfaction with the current Resource Room program between the Division two nonresource students and the primary resource and primary nonresource students respectively.

Differences were found in the student ratings of academic self-concept between the primary nonresource students and the primary resource, Divsion two resource and Division two nonresource students respectively. With the exception of one subtest item, examination of percentage of individual responses substantiated these results.

This study also investigated the knowledge base and perception of the parents of the Resource Room students through the calculation of means and standard deviations as well as through percentages of individual responses in the areas of (1) roles and objectives of the Resource Room program (2) selected criteria governing student placement and student responsibility in the resource program (3) expectations of the program (4) satisfaction with and (5) effectiveness of the program and (6) parent perception of the child's self-concept. (See Table 6) Comments provided by any of the respondents were discussed throughout the chapter.

As a result of similar issues addressed throughout the literature review and again within this study, a number of statements are appropriate as they impact upon Resource Room programs generally:

1. For consistent improvement in reading, the mild to moderately handicapped student with whom this study is concerned, must receive early resource placement preferably at the grade two level (Vergason, 1973; Hammill and Wiederholt, 1971; Finch, 1977). Placement must be made after careful evaluation and programming has occurred. The children themselves, and their parents should be actively involved in this evaluation of programming (Reger and Koppmann, 1971). Long term objectives should be thoroughly discussed with the parents who should be kept informed on a regular basis as to the progress of the child.

Further to the matter of early placement in the matter of academic self-concept. Gearheart (1980), Berres (1982), Finch (1977) and others have stressed the importance of early remediation before the student begins to view himself as academically inept. Social stigma as it relates to any deviation from the normal classroom setting and which is discussed further in this section, also has a direct impact upon academic self-concept (Berres, 1982). Awareness among professionals of student needs in the area of Language Arts as they apply to Resource Room assistance, needs to be heightened and procedures need to be followed to obtain assistance rapidly.

2. Communication between principals, resource and classroom teachers, reading clinicians, parents and the students themselves as to the progress of each student both in the Resource Room and in the regular classroom is vital to the progress of each resource student

and should be carried out on a regular and consistent basis (Glavin, Quay and Werry, 1971; Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972; Dugoff, 1985). Such conferencing might take place at recess on a specified day which is convenient to all interested parties (Glavin, Quay and Werry, 1971).

3. Hawisher and Calhoun (1978), Meece and Wang (1982) and others have described various models of resource rooms and their advantages. As pointed out by an administrator within this study, every school situation is different. It may be assumed, therefore, that careful consideration needs to be given to each of these school situations with its own unique set of conditions followed by the appropriate model for resourcing.

4. Sabatino (1972) and others have recognized that the mild to moderately handicapped student, with whom this study is concerned, appears to both require and benefit from the additional assistance provided within a Resource Room setting. However, it is clear both from the literature and from the results of this study, that these same children require this assistance on a regular and frequent basis. As well, it is imperative that individualized educational programs be designed for these children (Sevcik, Bonita et al., 1983).

Exposure to a variety of teaching materials to accommodate different learning styles is highly desirable. Resource Room teachers must, therefore, be highly qualified professionals in each of these areas. As discussed in the literature review, Adelman (1972), Hammill and Wiederholt (1972), Dugoff (1985) were among numerous writers who recognized the many roles and skills required of the resource

teacher. Indeed, a clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities of all of the professionals involved in the Resource Room program is essential to its effectiveness.

5. -- Although the noncategorical Resource Room with which this study is concerned does not require the categorization of disability, there appears to be a deleterious social stigma associated with the separation of resource students from regular classroom peers in order to attend the resource setting. Numerous writers throughout this study (Hewett with Forness, 1977; Gearheart, 1980; Barksdale and Atkinson, 1971; Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972; Hobbs, 1975; Berres, 1982) have addressed this critical area. Such stigma was evident in the percentages of responses which examined the student satisfaction subtest of the present study (items 1, 8, 9, 12; see Appendix E) as well as in the strength of the written comments of the older nonresource students discussed earlier within this chapter. In light of this critical social issue, therefore, classroom teachers need to make clear to the entire student body, the availability of the resource Room setting to all students. Clear delineation of available assistance within that setting as well as its objectives need to be clarified to all students in order to minimize the negative social stigma.

Recommendations

1. Communication among all professionals involved in the operation of the Resource Room is essential if its intervention is to make a positive impact upon the academic performance of the students placed in that setting. Comments provided by administrators, classroom and

resource teachers, and parents of resource students surveyed within this study reflected this need. The review of the literature substantiated the importance of such open communication. Glavin, Quay and Werry (1971) described resource settings in Philadelphia whereby a specific time and day was scheduled for close and ongoing communication among teachers, parents and principals regarding the progress of each Resource Room student. The present recommendation strongly suggests an advantage in more frequent and open communication.

2. Results of this survey would insist that resource students and their parents be more actively involved in the referral, placement and planning process within the Resource Room setting, thus lending a more informed approach to resource planning (Berres, 1982; Salvia and Ysseldyke, 1978). These processes need to be conveyed carefully to the students and parents, however, since Meece and Wang (1982) and Berres (1982), in two separate surveys referred to in the historical overview, found that the processes of resource placement were not always clearly understood by the students or the parents.

3. There is a need for educators to address the taunting, teasing and sense of alienation which confronts the mild to moderately handicapped Resource Room student with whom this study is concerned. One recommendation which developed following a study undertaken by Berres (1982), and discussed in the historical overview, recognized a need that this issue be studied further. Berres urged regular classroom teachers and nonresource students to become more sensitive to the social needs of these students. Comments expressed,

particularly by the older nonresource students surveyed within this study, clearly reflected this serious social issue. The principal and/or resource teacher of each elementary school throughout the District under study should alert other staff members whose students attend the program, as to this problem so that a more generally heightened awareness might avert potential social problems among resource students before such problems materialize.

4. Hawisher and Calhoun (1978) have outlined the many roles which the Resource Room teacher is expected to play: "diagnostician, remedial teacher, materials specialist, an advocate, and administrator of varied services" that impinge on the entire education program (p. 141). Thus as pointed out by Reger (1972), Adelman (1972), Finch (1977) and others, resource teachers must be well trained; well informed professionals. Indeed, resource teachers should be consulted as to areas of particular concern, interest and need for assistance. These writers emphasize the importance of provisions for regular resource teacher training and inservice. Moreover, Dugoff (1985) has recognized the undue tension and stress to which resource teachers may be exposed because of the multifaceted roles outlined above and the myriad of people with whom the resource teacher must interact. To remedy this negative situation, Dugoff makes the following recommendation:

> The keys to managing this multifacteted interactive role are communication and collaboration. When professionals working together realize they hold different views, that knowledge provides a basis for resolving conflicts. In order to maximize integration and minimize strain, staff development activities need to address discrepant perceptions (p. 82).

In recognition of the many and varied roles and responsibilities of the resource teachers within the District under study, personal consultation of professional needs, access to inservices as mentioned earlier in this chapter, the availability of and the encouragement to use new materials, training in the use of new materials, as well as open communication and support from all school professionals are all areas, demanding of greater consideration.

Concluding Statement

In spite of the limitations of this study, the insights provided by the responses of the various groups allow speculation into several key areas. Although the analyses undertaken revealed no statistically significant differences between administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Room teachers on any of the four subtests under investigation, percentages of individual responses as well as written comments revealed a number of concerns including early placement and availability of more time in the Resource Room, careful scheduling, greater communication between professionals directly involved in the Resource Room program, and more individualization of resource programs.

Statistical analysis and percentage breakdowns of individual responses revealed significant differences between the primary students and their older counterparts in their perceptions of satisfaction with the resource setting. Comments provided by the students reemphasize the need for early placement, individualized remediation and reentry into the regular classroom before negative attitudes are formed.

Statistical analyses revealed significant differences whereby the primary nonresource students showed a consistently more positive academic self-concept than either their primary or Division two counterparts. These findings were reenforced when percentages of individual responses were examined. Clearly, even in a noncategorical resource setting where categorization of disability is not a requirement for placement, Resource Room students appear to feel stigmatized and, to some degree, alienated from their regular classroom peers. These social issues need to be further addressed as they impact directly upon the academic self-concept particularly of the older Resource Room student.

The parent questionnaires revealed a number of issues which demand immediate attention: the involvement of parents of Resource Room students in the entire process of resource placement; full knowledge of the goals of the Resource Room placement as they apply to the individual student; open communication between the parents and other professionals involved in the resource setting. Although the noncategorical Resource Room appears to be the preferred setting for language arts remediation of the mildly handicapped student to either the special class or the categorical Resource Room, there are issues which require further research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, E. (1974). The mother is the first to know. Academic Therapy, 9 (5), 373-376.

Adams, G. L. (1982). The reliance on resource room placement by future teachers. Education, 2, (4), 343-347.

Adelman, H. S. (1972). The resource concept - bigger than a room! The Journal of Special Education, 6, (4), 361-367.

Barksdale, M. W. and Atkinson, A. P. (1971). A resource room approach to instruction for the educable mentally retarded. Focus on Exceptional Children, 3, 12-15.

Bennett, A. A. (1963). A comparative of the progress of subnormal pupils in the grades and in special classes. New York: Columbia University.

Berres, M. S. (1982). Resource Programs: through the eyes of the student. New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 678).

Brenton, M. (1974). Mainstreaming the handicapped. Today's Education, 63, 22-25.

Cassidy, V., and Stanton, J. (1959). An investigation of factors involved in the educational placement of mentally retarded children: a study of differences between children in special and regular classes in Ohio. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Chaffin, J. D. (1974). Will the real mainstreaming program please stand up! Focus on Exceptional Children, 6 (5), 1-18.

Church, E. J. M. (1980). Special education in Alberta past accomplishments, present issues and future prospects. Special Education Across Canada, 23-37.

Davis, Marie. (1982). A survey of teacher attitudes towards in-class versus pull-out compensatory reading programs. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kean College, Union, New Jersey.

Davis, N. (1970). Resource rooms: from the past to the present. Unpublished term paper, Temple University.

Deno, E. (1973). Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.

Dugoff, S. K., Ives, R. K., and Shotel, J. R. (1985). Public school and university staff perceptions of the role of the resource teacher. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8 75-82.

Elenbogen, M. A. (1957). A comparative study of some aspects of academic and social adjustment of ten groups of mentally retarded children in special and regular grades. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University.

Fox, W. F., Egner, A. N., Paolucci, P. B., Perelman, P. F. and McKenzie, H. S. (1973). An introduction to a regular classroom approach to special education. In E. Deno (Ed.)., Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.

Finch, E. and Craig J. (1977). Evaluation of elementary language arts assistance program (E.L.A.A.P.). Edmonton Public School Board, Alberta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 837).

Frampton, M. E. and Gall, D. E. (Eds.). (1955). Special education for the exceptional. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Friend, M., and McNutt, G. (1984). Resource room programs: Where are we now? Exceptional Children, 51, 150-155.

Gearheart, W. R. (1980). Special education for the 80's. Toronto: Mosby.

Gickling, E. E., Murphy, L. C., and Mallory, D. W., (1979). Teachers' preference for resource services. Exceptional Children, 45, 442-449.

Glavin, J. P., Quay, H. C., Annesley, F. R. and Werry, J. S. (1971). An experimental resource room for behavior problem children. Exceptional Children, 37, 131-137.

Glavin, J. P., Quay, H. C. and Werry, J. S. (1971). Behavioral and academic gains of conduct problem children in different classroom settings. Exceptional Children, 37, 441-446.

Hammill, D. D. (1972). The resource room model in special education. The Journal of Special Education, 6, 349-354.

Hammill, D. D. and Bartel, N. R. (1978). Teaching children with learning and behavior problems (2nd ed.). Boston, London, Sydney: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Hammill, D. D., Iano, R., McGettigan, J., and Wiederholt, J. L. (in press). Retardates reading achievement in the resource room model: the first year. Training School Bulletin.

Hammill, D. D. and Wiederholt, J. L. (1972). The resource room: rationale and implementation. Journal of Special Education Press. Philadelphia: Grune and Stratton.

Hawisher, M. F. and Calhoun, M. L. (1978). The resource room. Sydney: Charles E. Merriel, Publishing Co.

Hayes, M. V. (1983). A survey of teacher attitudes towards in-class versus pull-out compensatory reading programs. U.S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 619).

Heller, H. W. (1972). The resource room: A mere change or real opportunity for the handicapped? The Journal of Special Education, 6, (4), 369-375.

Hewett, F. M. with Forness, S. R. (1977). Education of exceptional learners. (2nd ed.). Boston, London, Sydney, Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Hobbs, N. (1975). The future of children: categories, labels and their consequences. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hudson, F., Reisberg, L. E., and Wolf, R. (1983). Changing teachers' perceptions of mainstreaming. Teacher Education and Special Education, 17, 18-24.

Johnson, G.O. (1962). Special education for mentally handicapped - a paradox. Exceptional Child, 19, 62-69.

Larsen, S. C. (1976). The learning disabilities specialist: Role and responsibilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 9, 498-508.

Lecky, P. (1961). Self-consistency. U.S.A.: The Shoe String Press, Inc.

Lilly, M. S. (1971). A training based model for special education. Exceptional Children, 37, 745-749.

MacMillan, D. L. (1973). Issues and trends in special education. Mental Retardation, 11, (2), 3-8.

Marsh, G. E., Price, B. J., and Smith, T. E. C. (1983). Teaching mildly handicapped children: Methods and materials. St. Louis: Mosby.

Meece, J. L. and Wang, M. C. (1982). Comparative study of the social attitudes and behavior of mildly handicapped children in two mainstreaming programs. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Learning Research and Development Centre. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 221005).

Meyers, R. I. and Hammill, D. D. (1976). Methods for learning disorders. (2nd. ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Ohrtman, W. F. (1972). One more instant solution coming up! The Journal of Special Education, 6, (4), 377-381.

Pertsch, C. (1936). A comparative study of the progress of subnormal pupils in the grades and in special classes. New York: Columbia University.

Philage, M. L. and Kuna, D. J. (1975). The therapeutic contract and learning disabled families. Academic Therapy, 10, (4), 407-411.

Quay, H. C. and Peterson, D. R. (1967). Manual for the behavior problem checklist. (Mimeographed). Illinios: Children's Research Centre, University of Illinios.

Reger, R. (1972). Resource rooms: change agents or guardians of the status quo? The Journal of Special Education, 6, (4), 355-359.

Reger, R. and Koppmann, M. (1971). The child-oriented resource room. Exceptional Children, 37, 460-462.

Resource Room Handbook, St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6, 60 Sir Winston Churchill Avenue, St. Albert, Alberta, T8N 0G4, 1982.

Rusalem, H. and Rusalem, H. (1980). Psychological aspects of special education environments. In W. Cruickshank (Ed.) Psychology of Exceptional Children and Youths. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Sabatino, D. A. (1971). An evaluation of resource rooms for children with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 4, 84-93.

Sabatino, D. A. (1972). Resource rooms: The renaissance in special education. The Journal of Special Education, 6, (4), 335-347.

Salvia and Ysseldyke, J. (1978). Assessment in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Schulz, J. B. and Turnbull, A. P. (1984). Mainstreaming handicapped students a guide for classroom teachers. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Sevcik, B.; and Others (1984). Curriculum bases measurement: effects on instruction, teacher estimates of student progress, and student knowledge of performance. Minneapolis University: Institute for Research and Learning Disabilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 236 196).

Sevcik, B.; and Others (1983). Communication of IEP goals and student progress among parents, regular classroom teachers, and administrators using systematic formative evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 842).

Sindelar, P. T., and Deno, S. (1978). The effectiveness of resource programming. Journal of Special Education, 12, 17-26.

Stewart, F. K. (1983). Teacher attitudes and expectations regarding mainstreaming of handicapped children. Teacher Education and Special Education, 6, 39-45.

Teleford, C. W. and Sawrey, J. M. (1981). The exceptional individual (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Thurstone, T. (1960). An evaluation of education of mentally handicapped children in special classes and in regular grades. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Vergason, G. A. (1973). Accountability in special education. Exceptional Children, 39, 451-461.

Wiederholt, J. L., Hammill, D. D., and Brown, V. (1978). The resource teacher: A guide to effective practises. Boston, London, Sydney: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

Ysseldyke, J. and Thurlow, M. (Eds.) (1980). The special education assessment and decision making process: Seven case studies. (Research report No. 44). Minneapolis: Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. 203 589).

Zito, R. J. and Bardon, J. L. (1969). Achievement motivation among negro adolescents in regular and special education programs. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 74, 20-26.

APPENDIX A

RESOURCE ROOM SURVEY

April 1, 1986

Memo To: All District Office Administrators
Elementary Principals and Vice-Principals
Elementary Resource Room Teachers
Elementary Classroom Teachers whose students attend Resource Rooms
All Elementary Resource Room students
All non-Resource Room students within those classrooms
Parents of Elementary Resource Room students

From: Mrs. Mary Thomson, teacher
Keenooshayo Elementary School
40 Woodlands Road
St. Albert, Alberta
T8N 3X3
Phone: 459-3114 (school)
487-8571 (residence)

The research project represented by the enclosed questionnaire is directed toward providing information as to the knowledge concerning the Resource Room concept and the perceived effectiveness of Resource Room programs currently operating throughout the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District No. 6. This project has received the approval of Mr. L. Beaudry, Superintendent of Schools.

Information received is strictly confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only. It will not be presented in any manner that allows for identification with individuals or schools.

Part A of the questionnaire is designed to assess your understanding of the Resource Room program as it exists in St. Albert P.S.S.D. No. 6. Please respond without reference to special education handbooks or program brochures.

Part B is designed to survey your perception regarding the effectiveness of the Resource Room Program.

A high response rate is essential if an accurate assessment of current Resource Room programs is to be obtained. The questionnaire will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. It would be greatly appreciated if you would answer the questions to the best of your ability and return to the Resource Room teacher at your school, in a sealed envelope, by April 25.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mary Thomson (M. Ed. Thesis/Questionnaire)

St. Albert Protestant Board of Education

60 Sir Winston Churchill Ave., St. Albert, Alberta, Canada T8N 0G4
PBX (403) 458-2060

1986 04 01

To : Mary Thomson

From : Lawrence Beaudry,
Superintendent of Schools

Your request to survey the attitudes of District staff with respect to the resource room program as part of your research for an M.Ed. thesis is approved.

We look forward to receiving the results of your study and recommendations that may follow. Good luck with your program.

L. Beaudry

LAB/s

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Lois Hole
Don Witwicky
Chairman
Charles Schroder
Shirley McCaffery
Susan Waldie

APPENDIX B

PART I - ADMINISTRATORS

Prior to completing the survey, please indicate with a check ( ) whether you are an administrator

___ within District Office
___ within a school

PART A

Please answer the following questions by circling the number in front of the appropriate answers.

1. Resource Room assistance in St. Albert is limited to elementary school pupils enrolled in regular classes who:

   1. Are of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.
   2. Are of below average ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.
   3. Are simply in need, irrespective of level of intelligence.

2. For a full-time resource teacher, the upper limit of students per week as recommended by the Provincial Guidelines for Resource Room assistance is:

   1. Fifteen (15)
   2. Twenty-five (25)
   3. As many as the classroom and Resource Room teachers have agreed upon.

3. The major objective of the Resource Room is to:

   1. Relieve the pressure upon regular classroom teachers who would otherwise have to remediate students of below average achievement level by more than one year.
   2. Remediate children whose performance in the Language Arts has been negatively affected primarily by emotional disturbance.
   3. Overcome specific deficits in the Language Arts skills before emotional and social complications set in.

4. The role of the Principal is to:

   1. Approve the selection of students for Resource Room assistance.
   2. Provide training for the Resource Room teacher.
   3. Supply requested psychological information relating to the students.

5. The main role of the school counsellor in relation to Resource Room functioning is to:
   1. Pre-test and post-test children attending the Resource Room.
   2. Work in cooperation with staff members (classroom teacher, Resource Room teacher, Reading Clinician) in the identification of pupils for special program needs.
   3. Communicate the possibility of special placement for students with continuous serious learning deficits.

6. One major purpose of the Resource Room is:
   1. To remediate all or any weak areas of the Language Arts early so that the child is able to cope in the regular classroom.
   2. To include children who are seriously handicapped visually or auditorially.
   3. To remediate children whose expected and actual performance are both below average achievement level.

7. The optimum number of students to which the Resource Room teacher provides assistance is:
   1. Either individually or in small groups of no more than six (6) students at a time.
   2. No fewer than six (6) students at a time.
   3. Either individually or in groups which is both convenient and manageable.

8. The Resource Room teacher should:
   1. Refer each Resource student to the counsellor for pre-testing and post-testing.
   2. Pre-test and post-test each child attending the Resource Room.
   3. Pre-test and post-test only those children who appear to require same.

9. The classroom teacher is expected to:
   1. Decide upon scheduling which is most convenient for him/her and the Resource Room teacher shall carry this out.
   2. Cooperate with the Resource Room teacher in scheduling time for students to be out of the classroom.
   3. Schedule children for Resource Room instruction during music, art and physical education periods.

10. Resource Room students:
    1. Should be free to arrive at the Resource Room at any time during the allotted time period so as to complete work in the regular classroom.
    2. Should return to regular classroom as soon as work allotted in Resource Room is completed.
    3. Are expected to regard their Resource Room program as a privilege and must enter and exit promptly and in an orderly fashion.

11. The Reading Clinician:

    1. Is responsible for training the Resource Room teacher in many aspect of operating the Resource Room.
    2. Is responsible for developing appropriate remedial programs.
    3. Is responsible for assisting classroom teachers only in integrating the Resource Room program with classroom curricula.

PART B

Please circle the appropriate number indicating the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements:-

Use the key below in responding:-

1. Strongly agree (SA)
2. Agree (A)
3. Undecided (U)
4. Disagree (D)
5. Strongly disagree (SD)

	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Most Resource Room students appear to be making significant gains in the basic skills of Language Arts in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
13. There appears to be a definite strengthening of self-concept in most Resource Room students.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Most students have shown a significant increase in their desire to read for enjoyment since attending the Resource Room.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Most students go off to resource happily.	1	2	3	4	5
16. There is effective ongoing communication between most Resource Room teachers and classroom teachers as to the progress, or lack of it, of each student.	1	2	3	4	5

		SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	There is effective, ongoing communication between most parents and Resource Room teachers, as well as between parents and classroom teachers, as to their children's weaknesses and gains within the Resource Room program.	1	2	3	4	5

Please add any comments you may wish to make.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PART 2 - CLASSROOM TEACHERS

PART A

Please answer the following questions by circling the number in front of the appropriate answers.

1. Resource Room assistance in St. Albert is limited to elementary school pupils enrolled in regular classes who:
   1. Are of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.
   2. Are of below average ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.
   3. Are simply in need, irrespective of level of intelligence.

2. For a full-time resource teacher, the upper limit of students per week as recommended by the Provincial Guidelines for Resource Room assistance is:
   1. Fifteen (15)
   2. Twenty-five (25)
   3. As many as the classroom and Resource Room teachers have agreed upon.

3. The major objective of the Resource Room is to:
   1. Relieve the pressure upon regular classroom teachers who would otherwise have to remediate students of below average achievement level by more than one year.
   2. Remediate children whose performance in the Language Arts has been negatively affected primarily by emotional disturbance.
   3. Overcome specific deficits in the Language Arts skills before emotional and social complications set in.

4. The role of the Principal is to:
   1. Approve the selection of students for Resource Room assistance.
   2. Provide training for the Resource Room teacher.
   3. Supply requested psychological information relating to the students.

5. The main role of the school counsellor in relation to Resource Room functioning is to:
   1. Pre-test and post-test children attending the Resource Room.
   2. Work in cooperation with staff members (classroom teacher, Resource Room teacher, Reading Clinician) in the identification of pupils for special program needs.
   3. Communicate the possibility of special placement for students with continuous serious learning deficits.

6. One major purpose of the Resource Room is:
   1. To remediate all or any weak areas of the Language Arts early so that the child is able to cope in the regular classroom.
   2. To include children who are seriously handicapped visually or auditorially.
   3. To remediate children whose expected and actual performance are both below average achievement level.

7. The optimum number of students to which the Resource Room teacher provides assistance is:
   1. Either individually or in small groups of no more than six (6) students at a time.
   2. No fewer than six (6) students at a time.
   3. Either individually or in groups which is both convenient and manageable.

8. The Resource Room teacher should:
   1. Refer each Resource student to the counsellor for pre-testing and post-testing.
   2. Pre-test and post-test each child attending the Resource Room.
   3. Pre-test and post-test only those children who appear to require same.

9. The classroom teacher is expected to:
   1. Decide upon scheduling which is most convenient for him/her and the Resource Room teacher shall carry this out.
   2. Cooperate with the Resource Room teacher in scheduling time for students to be out of the classroom.
   3. Schedule children for Resource Room instruction during music, art and physical education periods.

10. Resource Room students:
   1. Should be free to arrive at the Resource Room at any time during the allotted time period so as to complete work in the regular classroom.
   2. Should return to regular classroom as soon as work allotted in Resource Room is completed.
   3. Are expected to regard their Resource Room program as a privilege and must enter and exit promptly and in an orderly fashion.

11. The Reading Clinician:
   1. Is responsible for training the Resource Room teacher in many aspect of operating the Resource Room.
   2. Is responsible for developing appropriate remedial programs.
   3. Is responsible for assisting classroom teachers only in integrating the Resource Room program with classroom curricula.

PART B

Please circle the appropriate number indicating the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements:-

Use the key below in responding:-

1. Strongly agree (SA)
2. Agree (A)
3. Undecided (U)
4. Disagree (D)
5. Strongly disagree (SD)

		SA	A	U	D	SD
12.	Most of your Resource Room students appear to be making significant gains in the basic skills of Language Arts in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	There appears to be a definite strengthening of self-concept in most of your Resource Room students.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Most of your students have shown a significant increase in their desire to read for enjoyment since attending the Resource Room.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Most of your students go off to Resource happily.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	There is effective ongoing communication between you and the Resource Room teacher as to the progress, or lack of it, of most of the children.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	There is effective, ongoing communication between you and most of the parents as to their children's weaknesses and gains within the the Resource Room program.	1	2	3	4	5

Please add any comments you may wish to make.

PART 3 - RESOURCE ROOM TEACHERS

PART A

Please answer the following questions by circling the number in front of the appropriate answers.

1. Resource Room assistance in St. Albert is limited to elementary school pupils enrolled in regular classes who:
   1. Are of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.
   2. Are of below average ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.
   3. Are simply in need, irrespective of level of intelligence.

2. For a full-time resource teacher, the upper limit of students per week as recommended by the Provincial Guidelines for Resource Room assistance is:
   1. Fifteen (15)
   2. Twenty-five (25)
   3. As many as the classroom and Resource Room teachers have agreed upon.

3. The major objective of the Resource Room is to:
   1. Relieve the pressure upon regular classroom teachers who would otherwise have to remediate students of below average achievement level by more than one year.
   2. Remediate children whose performance in the Language Arts has been negatively affected primarily by emotional disturbance.
   3. Overcome specific deficits in the Language Arts skills before emotional and social complications set in.

4. The role of the Principal is to:
   1. Approve the selection of students for Resource Room assistance.
   2. Provide training for the Resource Room teacher.
   3. Supply requested psychological information relating to the students.

5. The main role of the school counsellor in relation to Resource Room functioning is to:
   1. Pre-test and post-test children attending the Resource Room.
   2. Work in cooperation with staff members (classroom teacher, Resource Room teacher, Reading Clinician) in the identification of pupils for special program needs.
   3. Communicate the possibility of special placement for students with continuous serious learning deficits.

6. One major purpose of the Resource Room is:
   1. To remediate all or any weak areas of the Language Arts early so that the child is able to cope in the regular classroom.
   2. To include children who are seriously handicapped visually or auditorially.
   3. To remediate children whose expected and actual performance are both below average achievement level.

7. The optimum number of students to which the Resource Room teacher provides assistance is:
   1. Either individually or in small groups of no more than six (6) students at a time.
   2. No fewer than six (6) students at a time.
   3. Either individually or in groups which is both convenient and manageable.

8. The Resource Room teacher should:
   1. Refer each Resource student to the counsellor for pre-testing and post-testing.
   2. Pre-test and post-test each child attending the Resource Room.
   3. Pre-test and post-test only those children who appear to require same.

9. The classroom teacher is expected to:
   1. Decide upon scheduling which is most convenient for him/her and the Resource Room teacher shall carry this out.
   2. Cooperate with the Resource Room teacher in scheduling time for students to be out of the classroom.
   3. Schedule children for Resource Room instruction during music, art and physical education periods.

10. Resource Room students:
   1. Should be free to arrive at the Resource Room at any time during the allotted time period so as to complete work in the regular classroom.
   2. Should return to regular classroom as soon as work allotted in Resource Room is completed.
   3. Are expected to regard their Resource Room program as a privilege and must enter and exit promptly and in an orderly fashion.

11. The Reading Clinician:
   1. Is responsible for training the Resource Room teacher in many aspect of operating the Resource Room.
   2. Is responsible for developing appropriate remedial programs.
   3. Is responsible for assisting classroom teachers only in integrating the Resource Room program with classroom curricula.

PART B

Please circle the appropriate number indicating the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements:-

Use the key below in responding:-

1. Strongly agree (SA)
2. Agree (A)
3. Undecided (U)
4. Disagree (D)
5. Strongly disagree (SD)

	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Most of your Resource Room students appear to be making significant gains in the basic skills of Language Arts in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
13. There appears to be a definite strengthening of self-concept in most of your Resource Room students.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Most of your Resource Room students have shown a significant increase in their desire to read books for enjoyment other than those used in formal lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Most of your students arrive at the Resource Room happily.	1	2	3	4	5
16. There is effective ongoing communication between you and the Classroom teacher as to the progress, or lack of it, of most of the children.	1	2	3	4	5
17. There is effective, ongoing communication between you and most of the parents as to their children's weaknesses and gains within the the Resource Room program.	1	2	3	4	5

Please add any comments you may wish to make.

APPENDIX C

PART 4 - RESOURCE STUDENTS IN GRADES 2 AND 3

DIRECTIONS

You can help to make the Resource Room even better than it is now by answering each question carefully. Listen closely to your teacher's instructions. Mark your answers with a big X.

Examples:

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
A.	Ice cream tastes better than salt.			
B.	The Oilers are the worst hockey team in the NHL.			
1.	I am lucky to have been chosen to go to the Resource Room.			
2.	The Resource Room teacher should make a plan for each student to help him or her to learn better.			
3.	The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should tell each other how each student is doing.			
4.	I expect to do much better work in my own classroom after being in the Resource Room.			
5.	I try really hard to do my best work in my Resource Room class.			
6.	Children go to the Resource Room because they need extra help with some of their school work.			

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
7.	I expect to be able to keep going to the Resource Room until my work has really improved.			
8.	It's fun going to resource.			
9.	The other students in my Resource Room class are friendly with each other.			
10.	I am as smart as the other students in my Resource Room class.			
11.	I am as smart as the other students in my own classroom.			
12.	In the Resource Room we do many things that are fun.			
13.	My parents are happy with the work I do in the Resource Room.			

Do you have anything more you would like to say about the Resource Room? Write me a little note.

PART 5 - RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS (GRADES 4, 5 AND 6 ONLY)

DIRECTIONS

You can help to make the Resource Room programme even better by giving careful thought to each of the questions below. Your honest answer to each question will be the best answer. Thank you for helping us to evaluate the Resource Room programme. Please answer each question by circling your choice:

YES (Y) NO (N) UNCERTAIN (U)

Examples

1.	Ice cream tastes better than salt.	Y	N	U
2.	The Oilers are the worst hockey team in the NHL.	Y	N	U

1.	It is a real privilege to be chosen to go to the Resource Room.	Y	N	U
2.	The Resource Room teacher should set up an individual plan for each student which will help him or her to learn better.	Y	N	U
3.	The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should tell each other how each student is doing both in the Resource Room and in the classroom.	Y	N	U
4.	I expect to do much better work in my own classroom after being in the Resource Room.	Y	N	U
5.	I try really hard to do my best work in my Resource Room class.	Y	N	U
6.	Children go to the Resource Room because they need extra help with some of their school work.	Y	N	U
7.	I expect to keep going to the Resource Room until my work has really improved.	Y	N	U
8.	I enjoy my Resource Room class.	Y	N	U

9.	The other students in my Resource Room class are friendly with each other.	Y	N	U
10.	I am as smart as the other students in my Resource Room class.	Y	N	U
11.	I am as smart as the other students in my own classroom.	Y	N	U
12.	In the Resource Room we do many things that are exciting and challenging.	Y	N	U
13.	My parents are happy with the work I do in the Resource Room.	Y	N	U
14.	Going to the Resource Room has given me self-confidence.	Y	N	U
15.	Going to the Resource Room has made me want to learn more.	Y	N	U
16.	The work that I do in the Resource Room has helped me to develop better study habits.	Y	N	U
17.	Because I am in the Resource Room, I have learned many new skills.	Y	N	U
18.	I like the way my Resource Room classes are run.	Y	N	U

Do you have anything more to say about the Resource Room? Write me a little note.

PART 6 - NON-RESOURCE STUDENTS IN GRADES 2 AND 3

DIRECTIONS

Even though you do not go to Resource, we need your help to make it an even better place in which to learn. Please listen carefully to your teacher's instructions. Mark your answer with a big X.

Examples:

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
A.	Ice cream tastes better than salt.			
B.	The Oilers are the worst hockey team in the NHL.			
1.	I would feel really lucky to be chosen to go to the Resource Room.			
2.	The Resource Room teacher should decide carefully how to help each student in the Resource Room.			
3.	The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should tell each other how each student is doing.			
4.	I would probably do much better work in my own classroom if I went to the Resource room.			
5.	I would try hard to do my best work if I went to resource.			
6.	Children go to the Resource Room because they need extra help with some of their work.			

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
7.	I would want to keep going to resource until my work had really improved.			
8.	It would be fun to go to resource.			
9.	I am sure that the Resource Room would be a friendly place.			
10.	If I went to Resource, I would feel just as smart as the other students in that class.			
11.	I am as smart as the other students in my own classroom.			
12.	In the Resource Room we would probably do many things that would interest me.			

Do you have anything more you would like to say about the Resource Room? Write me a little note.

PART 7 - NON-RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS (GRADES 4, 5 AND 6 ONLY)

DIRECTIONS

You can help to make the Resource Room programme even better by giving careful thought to each of the questions below. Your honest answer to each question will be the best answer. Thank you for helping us to evaluate the Resource Room programme. Please answer each question by circling your choice:

YES (Y) NO (N) UNCERTAIN (U)

Examples

1.	Ice cream tastes better than salt.	Y	N	U
2.	The Oilers are the worst hockey team in the NHL.	Y	N	U

1.	It would be a real privilege to be chosen to go to the Resource Room.	Y	N	U
2.	The Resource Room teacher should decide carefully how to help each student in the Resource Room.	Y	N	U
3.	The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should tell each other how each student is doing .	Y	N	U
4.	I would probably do much better work in my own classroom if I went to the Resource Room.	Y	N	U
5.	I would try hard to do my best work if I went to resource.	Y	N	U
6.	Children go to the Resource Room because they need extra help with some of their work.	Y	N	U
7.	I would want to keep going to the resource until my work had really improved.	Y	N	U
8.	I would enjoy going to resource.	Y	N	U
9.	I am sure that the Resource Room would be a friendly place.	Y	N	U

10. If I went to resource, I would feel just as smart as the other students in that class. Y N U

11. I am as smart as the other students in my own classroom. Y N U

12. In the Resource Room we would probably do many things that would interest me. Y N U

Do you have anything more to say about the Resource Room? Write me a little note.

PART 8 - PARENTS OF STUDENTS ATTENDING RESOURCE ROOM

DIRECTIONS

Please respond to each question by circling your choice. Your honest answer to each question will be the best answer.

YES (Y) NO (N) UNCERTAIN (U)

PART A

1. It is proposed that Resource Room assistance be limited to elementary school students enrolled in regular classes who are of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observation.

   Y N U

2. One major objective of the Resource Room is to overcome specific deficits in the language arts skills before emotional and social complications set in.

   Y N U

3. The Resource Room teacher's first responsibility is to the principal of the school being served.

   Y N U

4. Resource Room students are expected to regard their Resource Room program as a privilege.

   Y N U

5. The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should communicate closely as to the functioning of each Resource Room student.

   Y N U

PART B

6. I anticipate significant improvement in my child's progress in his/her regular classroom after being in the Resource Room.

   Y N U

7. I expect that my child will keep going to the Resource Room until his/her work has really improved.

   Y N U

8. My child appears to enjoy his time in the Resource Room.

Y N U

9. My child feels as smart as the other students in his/her regular classroom.

Y N U

10. I am happy with my child's progress in the Resource Room.

Y N U

Please add any comments you may wish to make.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

Results of Administrator, Classroom Teacher and Resource Teacher Survey

Roles and Objectives	Administrators Freq.	Administrators %	Classroom Teachers Freq.	Classroom Teachers %	Resource Teachers Freq.	Resource Teachers %
3. The major objective of the Resource Room is to:						
1. Relieve the pressure upon regular classroom teachers who would otherwise have to remediate students of below average achievement level by more than one year.	4	18.2	12	22.2	0	0.0
2. Remediate children whose performance in the Language Arts has been negatively affected primarily by emotional disturbance.	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
* 3. Overcome specific deficits in the Language Arts skills before emotional and social complications set in.	15	68.2	42	77.8	8	100.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. The role of the Principal is to:						
* 1. Approve the selection of students for Resource Room assistance.	15	68.2	31	57.4	6	75.0
2. Provide training for the Resource Room teacher.	1	4.5	5	9.3	1	12.5
3. Supply requested psychological information relating to the students.	0	0.0	10	18.5	0	0.0
Missing Data	6	27.3	8	14.8	1	12.5
5. The main role of the school counsellor in relation to Resource Room functioning is to:						
1. Pre-test and post-test children attending the Resource Room.	1	4.5	5	9.3	7	87.5
* 2. Work in cooperation with staff members (classroom teacher, Resource Room teacher, Reading Clinician) in the identification of pupils for special program needs.	15	68.2	39	72.2	0	0.0
3. Communicate the possibility of special placement for students with continuous serious learning deficits.	2	9.1	7	13.0	0	0.0
Missing Data	4	18.2	3	5.5	1	12.5

*Preferred Response

Roles and Objectives (continued)

	Administrators		Classroom Teachers		Resource Teachers	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
6. One major purpose of the Resource Room is:						
* 1. To remediate all or any weak areas of the Language Arts early so that the child is able to cope in the regular classroom.	16	72.8	33	61.1	6	75.0
2. To include children who are seriously handicapped visually or auditorially.	0	0.0	4	7.4	0	0.0
3. To remediate children whose expected and actual performance are both below average achievement level.	3	13.6	14	26.0	1	12.5
Missing Data	3	13.6	3	5.5	1	12.5
8. The Resource Room teacher should:						
1. Refer each Resource student to the counsellor for pre-testing and post-testing.	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
* 2. Pre-test and post-test each child attending the Resource Room.	11	50.0	34	63.0	7	87.5
3. Pre-test and post-test only those children who appear to require same.	8	36.4	19	35.2	1	12.5
Missing Data	2	9.1	1	1.8	0	0.0
11. The Reading Clinician:						
* 1. Is responsible for training the Resource Room teacher in many aspect of operating the Resource Room.	1	4.5	18	33.3	3	37.5
2. Is responsible for developing appropriate remedial programs.	11	50.1	23	42.6	1	12.5
3. Is responsible for assisting classroom teachers only in integrating the Resource Room program with classroom curricula.	5	22.7	8	14.8	2	25.0
Missing Data	5	22.7	5	9.3	2	25.0

* Preferred Response

Daily Functioning of Resource Room

	Administrators		Classroom Teachers		Resource Teachers	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Resource Room assistance in St. Albert is limited to elementary school pupils enrolled in regular classes who:						
* 1. Are of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.	7	31.9	18	33.3	6	75.0
2. Are of below average ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observations.	13	59.1	6	11.1	0	0.0
3. Are simply in need, irrespective of level of intelligence.	1	4.5	30	55.6	1	12.5
Missing Data	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	12.5
2. For a full-time resource teacher, the upper limit of students per week as recommended by the Provincial Guidelines for Resource Room assistance is:						
1. Fifteen (15)	5	22.7	17	31.5	1	12.5
* 2. Twenty-five (25)	8	36.4	20	37.0	7	87.5
3 As many as the classroom and Resource Room teachers have agreed upon.	7	31.8	12	22.2	0	0.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	5	9.3	0	0.0
7. The optimum number of students to which the Resource Room teacher provides assistance is:						
* 1. Either individually or in small groups of no more than six (6) students at a time.	6	27.3	25	46.3	6	75.0
2. No fewer than six (6) students at a time.	0	0.0	5	9.3	0	0.0
3. Either individually or in groups which are both convenient and manageable.	15	68.2	23	42.6	1	12.5
Missing Data	1	4.5	1	1.8	1	12.5

* Preferred Response

Daily Functioning of Resource Room (continued)

	Administrators		Classroom Teachers		Resource Teachers	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
9. The classroom teacher is expected to:						
1. Decide upon scheduling which is most convenient for him/her and the Resource Room teacher shall carry this out.	1	4.5	9	16.7	0	0.0
* 2. Cooperate with the Resource Room teacher in scheduling time for students to be out of the classroom.	19	86.4	45	83.3	8	100.0
3. Schedule children for Resource Room instruction during music, art and physical education periods.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
10. Resource Room students:						
1. Should be free to arrive at the Resource Room at any time during the allotted time period so as to complete work in the regular classroom.	3	13.6	10	18.5	0	0.0
2. Should return to regular classroom as soon as work allotted in Resource Room is completed.	6	27.3	15	27.8	0	0.0
* 3. Are expected to regard their Resource Room program as a privilege and must enter and exit promptly and in in an orderly fashion.	11	50.0	27	50.0	8	100.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	2	3.7	0	0.0

* Preferred response

Effectiveness

13. There appears to be a definite strengthening of self-concept in most Resource Room students		SA	A	U	D	SD	Missing Data
Administrators	Freq.	1	13	2	3	1	2
	%	4.5	59.2	9.1	13.6	4.5	9.1
Classroom Teachers	Freq.	16	21	7	7	0	3
	%	29.6	38.9	13.0	13.0	0.0	5.5
Resource Teachers	Freq.	3	4	0	0	1	0
	%	37.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0

Effectiveness (continued)

14. Most students have shown a significant increase in their desire to read for enjoyment since attending the Resource Room.

		SA	A	U	D	SD	Missing Data
Administrators	Freq.	2	3	12	4	0	1
	%	9.1	13.7	54.5	18.2	0.0	4.5
Classroom Teachers	Freq.	15	10	10	15	1	3
	%	27.8	18.5	18.5	27.8	1.9	5.5
Resource Teachers	Freq.	0	6	1	0	0	1
	%	0.0	75.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5

16. There is effective ongoing communication between most Resource Room teachers and classroom teachers as to the progress, or lack of it, of each student.

		SA	A	U	D	S	Missing Data
Administrators	Freq.	9	7	3	1	1	1
	%	40.9	31.9	13.7	4.5	4.5	4.5
Classroom Teachers	Freq.	27	19	4	0	2	2
	%	50.0	35.2	7.4	0.0	3.7	3.7
Resource Teachers	Freq.	1	7	0	0	0	0
	%	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

17. There is effective, ongoing communication between most parents and Resource Room teachers, as well as between parents and classroom teachers, as to their children's weaknesses and gains within the Resource room program.

		SA	A	U	D	SD	Missing Data
Administrators	Freq.	4	9	4	3	1	1
	%	18.2	40.9	18.2	13.7	4.5	4.5
Classroom Teachers	Freq.	17	16	7	10	2	2
	%	31.5	29.6	13.0	18.5	3.7	3.7
Resource Teachers	Freq.	1	4	2	0	0	1
	%	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	12.5

Satisfaction

12. Most Resource Room students appear to be making significant gains in the basic skills of readingin the regular classroom.

		SA	A	U	D	SD	Missing Data
Administrators	Freq.	0	9	6	3	2	2
	%	0.0	40.9	27.3	13.6	9.1	9.1
Classroom Teachers	Freq.	25	14	5	7	3	0
	%	46.3	25.9	9.3	13.0	5.5	0.0
Resource Teachers	Freq.	0	5	1	1	0	1
	%	0.0	62.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	12.5

15. Most students go off to resource happily.

		SA	A	U	D	SD	Missing Data
Administrators	Freq.	4	12	3	1	1	1
	%	18.2	54.6	13.7	4.5	4.5	4.5
Classroom Teachers	Freq.	30	15	5	2	0	2
	%	55.5	27.8	9.3	3.7	0.0	3.7
Resource Teachers	Freq.	5	3	0	0	0	0
	%	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

APPENDIX E

Results of Student Survey

Purpose and Function of Resource Room

		Primary Resource Students N=61				Division 2 Resource Students N=43				Primary Nonresource Students N=81				Division 2 Nonresource Students N=128			
2. The Resource Room teacher should make a plan for each student to help him or her to learn better.		Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
	Freq.	48	3	9	1	18	18	7	0	73	1	6	1	120	4	4	0
	%	78.7	4.9	14.8	1.6	41.9	41.9	16.2	0.0	90.1	1.2	7.5	1.2	93.8	3.1	3.1	0.0
3. The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should tell each other how each student is doing.		Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
	Freq.	47	3	11	0	34	6	2	1	57	2	13	9	98	18	12	0
	%	77.1	4.9	18.0	0	79.1	13.9	4.7	2.3	70.4	24	16.1	11.1	76.5	14.1	9.4	0
4. I expect to do much better work in my own classroom after being in the Resource Room.		Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
	Freq.	50	2	7	2	35	2	6	0	37	19	25	0	52	28	48	0
	%	81.9	3.3	11.5	3.3	81.4	4.7	13.9	0	45.7	23.5	30.8	0	40.6	21.9	37.5	0

*9 Missing Data

Purpose and Function of Resource Room (continued)

		Primary Resource Students N=61				Division 2 Resource Students N=43				Primary Nonresource Students N=81				Division 2 Nonresource Students N=128			
6. Children go to the Resource Room because they need extra help with some of their school work.		Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
	Freq.	51	10	0	0	40	0	2	1	66	15	0.0	0	106	4	18	0
	%	83.6	16.4	0.0	0	93.0	0	4.7	2.3	81.5	18.5	0.0	0	82.8	14.1	3.1	0
7. I expect to be able to keep going to the Resource Room until my work has really improved.		Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
	Freq.	52	2	7	0	37	2	4	0	60	11	10	0	93	18	17	0
	%	85.2	3.3	11.5	0	86.0	4.7	9.3	0	74.1	13.6	12.3	0	72.6	14.1	13.3	0
Satisfaction																	
1. I am lucky to have been chosen to go to the Resource Room.		Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
	Freq.	45	1	15	0	25	9	9	0	45	12	23	1	19	83	26	0
	%	73.8	1.6	24.6	0	58.2	20.9	20.9	0	55.6	14.8	28.4	1.2	14.9	64.8	20.3	0

*9 Missing Data

Satisfaction (continued)

	Primary Resource Students N=61				Division 2 Resource Students N=43				Primary Nonresource Students N=81				Division 2 Nonresource Students N=128			
5. I try really hard to do my best work in my Resource Room class.	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	55	1	4	1	39	0	4	0	73	3	5	0	108	6	14	0
%	90.2	1.6	6.6	1.6	90.7	0.0	9.3	0	90.1	3.7	6.2	0	84.4	4.7	10.9	0
8. It's fun going to resource.	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	52	3	5	1	40	2	1	0	47	6	28	0	48	51	29	0
%	85.3	4.9	8.2	1.6	93.0	4.7	2.3	0	58.0	7.4	34.6	0	37.5	39.8	22.7	0
9. The other students in my Resource Room class are friendly with each other.	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	48	1	8	4	31	2	6	4	70	1	10	0	67	18	43	0
%	78.6	1.6	13.2	6.6	72.0	4.7	14.0	9.3	86.5	1.2	12.3	0	52.3	14.1	33.6	0
12. In the Resource Room we do many things that are fun.	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	56	0	3	2	30	5	7	1	53	7	21	0	46	38	44	0
%	91.8	0	4.9	3.3	69.8	11.6	16.3	2.3	65.4	8.6	26.0	0	35.9	29.7	34.4	0

*9 Missing Data

Academic Self-Concept

	Primary Resource Students N=61				Division 2 Resource Students N=43				Primary Nonresource Students N=81				Division 2 Nonresource Students N=128			
10. I am as smart as the other students in my Resource Room class.	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	29	4	28	0	28	5	6	4	56	3	21	1	61	28	37	2
%	47.5	6.6	45.9	0	65.1	11.6	14.0	9.3	69.1	3.7	26.0	1.2	47.7	21.8	28.9	1.6
11. I am as smart as the other students in my own classroom.	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	20	22	18	1	16	13	12	2	42	8	31	0	79	23	25	1
%	32.8	36.1	29.5	1.6	37.2	30.2	27.9	4.7	51.9	9.8	38.3	0	61.7	17.9	19.5	0.8

Questions 14 - 18 (Division 2 Resource Students only)

	Y	N	U	*9
14. Going to the Resource Room has given me self-confidence.				
Freq.	32	6	5	0
%	74.4	14.0	11.6	0
15. Going to the Resource Room has made me want to learn more.	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	36	3	4	0
%	83.7	7.0	9.3	0

*9 Missing Data

	Division 2 Resource Students N=43			
16. The work that I do in the Resource Room has helped me to develop better study habits.	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	32	4	7	0
%	74.4	9.3	16.3	0
17. Because I am in the Resource Room, I have learned many new skills.	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	26	8	9	0
%	60.5	18.6	20.9	0
18. I like the way my Resource Room classes are run.	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	35	1	7	0
%	81.4	2.3	16.3	0

*9 Missing Data

APPENDIX F

Results of Parent Survey

Objectives

2. One major objective of the Resource Room is to overcome specific deficits in the language arts skills before emotional and social complications set in.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	73	1	4	1
%	92.4	1.3	5.1	1.3

Responsibilities

3. The Resource Room teacher's first responsibility is to the principal of the school being served.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	7	57	14	1
%	8.9	72.2	17.7	1.3

Selected Criteria Governing Resource Room Operation

1. It is proposed that Resource Room assistance be limited to elementary school students enrolled in regular classes who are of average or above average general ability as evidenced by either formal testing or teacher observation.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	21	38	18	2
%	26.6	48.1	22.8	2.5

4. Resource Room students are expected to regard their Resource Room program as a privilege.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	30	32	15	2
%	38.0	40.5	19.0	2.5

*9 Response missing

Expectations

5. The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should communicate closely as to the functioning of each Resource Room student.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	77	0	1	1
%	97.5	0	1.3	1.3

6. I anticipate significant improvement in my child's progress in his/her regular classroom after being in the Resource Room.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	63	4	12	0
%	79.7	5.1	15.2	0

7. I expect that my child will keep going to the Resource Room until his/her work has really improved.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	75	3	1	0
%	94.9	3.8	1.3	0

Satisfaction

10. I am happy with my child's progress in the Resource Room.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	56	4	18	1
%	70.8	5.1	22.8	1.3

8. My child appears to enjoy his time in the Resource Room.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	67	6	6	0
%	84.8	7.6	7.6	0

Academic Self-Concept

9. My child feels as smart as the other students in his/her regular classroom.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	39	18	20	2
%	49.4	22.8	25.3	2.5

*9 Response Missing

Expectations

5. The Resource Room teacher and the classroom teacher should communicate closely as to the functioning of each Resource Room student.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	77	0	1	1
%	97.5	0	1.3	1.3

6. I anticipate significant improvement in my child's progress in his/her regular classroom after being in the Resource Room.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	63	4	12	0
%	79.7	5.1	15.2	0

7. I expect that my child will keep going to the Resource Room until his/her work has really improved.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	75	3	1	0
%	94.9	3.8	1.3	0

Satisfaction

10. I am happy with my child's progress in the Resource Room.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	56	4	18	1
%	70.8	5.1	22.8	1.3

8. My child appears to enjoy his time in the Resource Room.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	67	6	6	0
%	84.8	7.6	7.6	0

Academic Self-Concept

9. My child feels as smart as the other students in his/her regular classroom.

	Y	N	U	*9
Freq.	39	18	20	2
%	49.4	22.8	25.3	2.5

*9 Response Missing